DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 140 903 JC 770 348

AUTHOR	Preising, Paul P., Ed.
TITLE	Student Residence Location, College Service Areas, and Socio Economic Census Data of the San Jose Community College District. A Demographic Profile Based Upon the 1975 Special Census.
INSTITUTION	San Jose Community Coll. District, Calif.
PUB DATE	Jun 77
NOTE	102p.; Colored maps included throughout the text may reproduce poorly. For a related document see ED 115 345
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$6.01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Census Figures; *Community Characteristics; Community Colleges; *Demography; Enrollment; Ethnic Distribution; Income; *Junior Colleges; Mexican Americans; Minority Groups; *Multicampus Districts; Population Distribution; *Residential Patterns; Socioeconomic Influences
IDENTIFIERS	California (San Jose); *San Jose Community College District CA

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to provide a tool for community college administrators and staff to use in the planning of appropriate programs and services, to explore several methods for defining the college service areas of the two district colleges, and to provide a means whereby demographic changes in the community might be monitored. Special Census data from 1975 were compared with findings of a previous study based on the 1970 census. The data revealed that the census tracts having the highest proportion of students essentially had a majority white population, medium to high income, and had shown the greatest growth in population since 1970. The census tracts having the smallest proportion of students had a Mexican American population, low income, a high unemployment rate, and had experienced a declining population since 1970. It was also noted that the district population was growing more rapidly and had a higher minority component than the county population. Suggestions for planning, recruitment, curriculum development, grant preparation, and recommendations for action resulted from the study. Data are organized into two graphs and 23 tables, and break down information on enrollment classification, demographic characteristics, residence, race, and population change between 1970 and 1975. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED140903

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

STUDENT RESIDENCE LOCATION, COLLEGE SERVICE AREAS, AND SOCIO ECONOMIC CENSUS DATA OF THE SAN JOSE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

A DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE
BASED UPON THE 1975 SPECIAL CENSUS

DIRECTED AND EDITED BY
PAUL P. PREISING
DISTRICT DIRECTOR - GRANTS AND RESEARCH
JUNE, 1977

JC 770 348

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGES
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS		1
I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	PURPOSE	2
III.	METHODOLOGY	3
IV.	DATA ANALYSIS: TABLES, MAPS AND GRAPHS	9
	A. STUDENT RESIDENT LOCATIONS TABLES	9
	TABLE #1	10
	TABLE #2	13
	TABLE #3	19
	TABLE #4	20
	TABLE #5	21
	B. COLLEGE SERVICE AREA	21a
	TABLE #6	22
	MAP I	25
	TABLE #7	27
	MAP II	28
	TABLE #8	29
	MAP III	32
	TABLE #9	35
	MAP IV	36
	TABLE #10	37
	TABLE #11	40
	MAP V	41
	MAP VI	42
	MAP VII	43

PAGES

C. CENSUS DATA..... 44

1. RACE DATA..... 44

TABLE #12..... 46

GRAPH I..... 50

TABLE #13..... 51

MAP VIII..... 52

TABLE #14..... 53

MAP IX..... 54

TABLE #15..... 55

MAP X..... 56

TABLE #16..... 57

MAP XI..... 58

TABLE #17..... 59

MAP XII..... 60

TABLE #18..... 61

MAP XIII..... 62

2. POPULATION DATA..... 63

TABLE #19..... 64

GRAPH II..... 67

MAP XIV..... 68

MAP XV..... 69

TABLE #20..... 70

MAP XVI..... 71

3. INCOME DATA..... 72

MAP XVII..... 73

TABLE #21..... 74

PAGES

TABLE 22..... 77

MAP XVIII..... 80

4. SUMMARY DATA..... 81

TABLE #23..... 82

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND USES OF THE STUDY..... 83

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION..... 86

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

After completion of the 1970 census study of the San Jose Community College District entitled Student Resident Locations and Socio Economic Census Data - A Demographic Profile, the Board of Trustees: John R. Brokenshire, Gael Douglass, John E. Marlow, Virginia Sandoval and Yancy L. William encouraged and approved this current effort.

Mr. George Francis, Associate Planner, Research Division, Santa Clara County Planning Department, offered encouragement and approved the raw data on which the study is based.

Dr. Bernard Fradkin and Ms. Jean Lawler of the Evergreen Valley College Learning Resources Center did a very cost effective job of creating and duplicating the tables and graphs.

Mrs. Carol Cabral, Grants and Research Secretary, typed the tables, made corrections and handled all of the logistics required to prepare copy for duplication. Again, the printing and duplication were handled by the San Jose City College reprographics staff.

Finally, Mrs. Jeanette Guthart, Consultant, implemented the plan of study, making the calculations, devising the tables, interpreting results and providing the first draft of the study. As was true with the earlier study, hers was the most significant individual contribution to this project.

Paul P. Preising
District Director
Grants/Research

I. INTRODUCTION

In August 1975, the Grants and Research office of San Jose Community College District produced a report entitled Student Resident Locations and Socio-Economic Census Data of the San Jose Community College District. This was a first attempt at building a data base for describing the student population of the District according to geography and census tract variables.

This current report documents the second year progress in updating the earlier data and proposes a definition of college service area for San Jose City and Evergreen Valley College. This effort, along with that of last year, provides some of the means by which the District and each of the Colleges can describe and monitor the demographic changes of the community so that as changes occur, programs and services can be modified to meet changing student requirements.

II. PURPOSE

The overall purpose of this study was to provide a tool for community college administrators and staff to use in planning appropriate programs and services. The primary purpose of this project was to explore various ways of defining a "college service area" for San Jose City and Evergreen Valley College. An appropriate method was to be selected and service areas were to be defined for each college. In addition, the study attempted to answer the question: "Which geographical areas or census tracts in the District have the highest probability of having students who prefer to attend San Jose City, and, which tracts have the highest probability of having students who prefer to attend Evergreen Valley College?"

A final purpose was to update the previous study which was based on 1970 census data, whereas this study utilized 1975 special census data. Trend analyses and changes in socio-economic data for the following variables: race, income, and population size, were to be described in a comparison between 1970 and 1975 data for the community.

III. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this study, can be viewed in two parts. One, was the collection of data to determine "college service areas," the other was the collection of demographic data from the 1975 special census for tracts within the District's boundaries. The following tasks were performed with regard to each of these parts:

"College Service Area":

1. The census tract number for each day and evening student at San Jose City and Evergreen Valley Colleges was determined by merging the student master file containing the students' address with the census tract file which assigned a census tract number to each address.
2. A computer print-out was obtained of the number and percentage of day, evening, and total day and evening students residing in each census tract who attended San Jose City, Evergreen Valley, or concurrently attended both colleges during the Spring 1976 semester.
3. All of the census tracts which had San Jose Community College District students residing in them were assigned to one of three categories. These were as follows:
   a. Tracts or parts of census tracts located within the Districts' boundary lines.

b. Census tracts located outside of the Districts' boundary lines, but within Santa Clara County.

Census tracts located within the Districts' boundary lines were identified in the previous study by overlaying the Districts' boundary lines on a census tract map for Santa Clara County.

4. A determination was made of the number and percentage of day, evening, and total day and evening students attending San Jose City, Evergreen Valley or concurrently attending both colleges who resided within the District's area; outside the District's area in Santa Clara County, and those outside of Santa Clara County.

5. Several methods were investigated in attempting to define service areas for each college in terms of census tract boundaries. One consideration was Method "A". Method "A" compared the number of students residing in a census tract to the college they attended. The census tract was classified as belonging to a college's service area if a majority of students in that tract attended that college. For example, census tract #500100 had a total of 56 day students residing there and of these 47 attended San Jose City and 9 attended Evergreen Valley College. Therefore, this tract would be viewed as belonging to San Jose City's service area. The major flaw of Method "A" is that San Jose City's day enrollment is larger than Evergreen Valley's (2.15 times), so that it masks Evergreen's contribution to each tract.

Using this method all the census tracts would belong to San Jose City's service area and none to Evergreen. For this reason, Method "A" was rejected.

A second method, Method "B" involved utilization of normalized enrollments. In this method, the relative importance of the number of students that each college contributes to the census tract is viewed in terms of the total enrollment for each college. A comparison is made of the percentage of San Jose City and Evergreen Valley students in a given tract. These percentages are calculated by dividing the number of students attending San Jose City, or Evergreen Valley Colleges for each tract into the total number of students attending each college. Comparing the percentages, if one school had 50% or more of the sum of the percentages, then that tract was awarded to the school having the highest percentage.

For example, census tract #500100 had 47 day students attending San Jose City. This was 1.04% of the total number of day students (4540) attending San Jose and living within the Districts' boundaries. Similarly the tract had nine (9) Evergreen Valley day students or 0.43% of the total number of Evergreen Valley day students (2111). Comparing 1.04% to 0.43%, census tract #500100 was awarded to the San Jose City College service area.

The advantage of this method is that it allows one to compare the enrollment of each college as if they were equal, so that the college with the larger population does not mask the contribution of the smaller college. This method also forces the tracts into one or the other college's service area with no overlap. Method "B" was viewed as being useful in understanding the importance of a census tract to each of the colleges and was, therefore, selected in determining service areas.

Method "B" viewed the data from one perspective and by no means offered a complete understanding of "college service area." In actuality, each census tract contributes students to both San Jose City and Evergreen Valley and service areas overlap. To determine the relative contribution of each of the census tracts to the population of each school, Method "C" was constructed.

Method "C" was constructed to address the following questions, "Which census tracts contribute the largest percentage of students to San Jose and Evergreen's total day enrollment and total evening enrollment?" To determine the answer to this question, the census tracts were rank ordered from high to low in terms of the number and percentage of the total number of students for each college. The census tract with the greatest percentage of students was given a rank of one. The day, evening and total enrollment for San Jose City, Evergreen Valley College and the District were rank ordered.

Next, quartile ranges were determined by computing one-fourth the total number of students at each college and for the District as a whole. The first quartile range (Q1) consists of approximately[1] 25% of the enrollment for that college and is made up of the tracts with the highest rankings. (1,2,3, etc.) The first quartile range (Q1) for San Jose City and Evergreen Valley have dissimilar numbers of students and census tracts, but are comparable in so far as the tracts in this range produce 25% of the total enrollment at each college. The tracts in this range contain the highest percentage of students and are the primary service area for the respective colleges.

In a sense, the foregoing methodology is akin to the classic story of an ant who finds himself on the body of an elephant. If the ant is in the elephant's head region, he sees one on view. When the ant is peering down at the elephant's tail, he obtains a different view. What we are attempting here, is to present two different analyses of the data with a view towards obtaining a more complete picture. This seemed to be the most reasonable way to proceed; however, arbitrariness of this method is evident.

Summarizing, Method "B" and "C" were used to determine service areas. Method "B" looked at a census tract by comparing its relative importance to San Jose City or Evergreen Valley College in terms of the total enrollment at

1. If a quartile break was indicated in the middle of a tract, the break was advanced to include the entire number of students in the tract.

each of the colleges. In Method "B" a tract was awarded to one college service area without overlap. Method "C" did not compare one college with the other, but asked the question, "Which census tracts are most important in contributing students to the total enrollment at San Jose City or Evergreen Valley College. In Method "C," service areas overlap and a tract can be considered to be important to both San Jose City and Evergreen Valley College.

6. Service area data are displayed on maps in order to make the geographic implications of the data and trends more meaningful. Maps were prepared of the District showing service areas for day and evening students (Evergreen Valley - yellow; San Jose City - blue). In addition, maps are used to display the census tracts in the first quartile (QI) range for San Jose City, Evergreen Valley, District, day, evening and total enrollment.

Demographic Data:

1975 census data were used to update the information collected in the previous study and to show trend analysis. Data which were available for comparisonwere: racial data, population data, and income data. Information dealing with the following factors were collected for each of the 73 census tracts within the Districts' boundaries:

1. Race Data

   a. Percent of White Population 1975

   b. Percent of Mexican Descent Population 1975

   c. Percent of Spanish Heritage Population 1975

   d. Percent of Black Population 1975

   e. Percent of Japanese Population 1975

   f. Percent of Chinese Population 1975

   g. Percent of Filipino Population 1975

   h. Percent of American Indian Population 1975

i. Percent of "Other" Race Ethnic Population 1975

j. Percent Unknown Population 1975

k. Comparison of 1970 race data with 1975 data for District and County

2. Income Data

Households by household income in 1974 grouped by ranges:

$2,000 - $9,999
$10,000 - $23,999
$24,000 - $50,000 or more

3. Population Data

a. Percent of total population 1966

b. Percent of total population 1970

c. Percent of total population 1975

d. Percentage change for total population for all ages between years 1966 - 1975.

e. Percentage change for total population for all ages between years 1970 - 1975.

4. Labor Force Status

Household population aged 14 and over by labor force status in the following categories:

a. Military

b. Employed full-time

c. Employed part-time

d. Unemployed

e. Retired

f. Homemaker

g. Student full-time

h. Student part-time

i. Other

Information concerning median family income, families below poverty level, and education completed were not included in the 1975 special census data. Consequently, comparisons with the information collected in the previous report could not be made.

The data for race, income, population, and labor force status were rank ordered by census tracts and grouped into the first quartile range.

Maps were prepared showing the location of the highest concentration (Q1) of minority racial populations, high, medium, and low income levels; areas having the highest unemployment rate and areas showing growth or decline in population between 1966 and 1975.

Bar graphs display the change in racial composition of the community between 1966-1975.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS: TABLES, MAPS AND GRAPHS

A. Student Resident Locations Tables

Table 1, lists the number and percentages of day and evening students who resided within the District's boundary lines during Spring 1976. The majority of students resided within the District's boundary lines (17,231 or 91.5%). There were 7,330 or 38.9% day students and 9,901 or 52.6% evening students, who attended and resided within the District's boundary.

The number of day and evening students who resided outside the District's boundary lines is shown in Table 2. Of this group, only two census tracts were located outside of Santa Clara County. There was a total of 1,575 (8.4%) students who resided in Santa Clara County and 22 (0.12%), who resided outside of Santa Clara County.

TABLE #1

TOTAL DAY AND EVENING STUDENTS ATTENDING
SAN JOSE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT AND RESIDING WITHIN
DISTRICT'S BOUNDARIES BY CENSUS TRACTS

I. CENSUS TRACTS WITHIN DISTRICT'S BOUNDARIES

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	TOTAL STUDENT	% TOTAL
500100	58	0.308	74	0.393	132	0.701
500200	35	0.186	65	0.345	100	0.531
500300	40	0.212	35	0.186	75	0.398
500400	40	0.212	108	0.574	148	0.786
+500500	62	0.329	72	0.382	134	0.712
500600	64	0.340	80	0.425	144	0.765
500700	27	0.143	27	0.143	54	0.287
500800	34	0.181	34	0.181	68	0.361
500900	80	0.425	62	0.329	142	0.754
501000	63	0.335	56	0.297	119	0.632
501100	102	0.542	109	0.579	211	1.121
501200	69	0.366	58	0.308	127	0.675
501300	105	0.558	65	0.345	170	0.903
501400	68	0.361	56	0.297	124	0.659
501500	52	0.276	71	0.377	123	0.653
501600	84	0.446	95	0.505	179	0.951
501700	44	0.234	51	0.271	95	0.505
501800	84	0.446	90	0.478	174	0.924
501900	36	0.191	30	0.159	66	0.351
+502000	104	0.552	98	0.521	202	1.073
+502102	48	0.255	34	0.181	82	0.436
+502300	66	0.351	56	0.297	122	0.648
502400	86	0.457	108	0.574	194	1.030
502500	102	0.542	117	0.621	219	1.163
+502600	11	0.058	32	0.170	43	0.228
+502902	57	0.303	52	0.276	109	0.579
502903	100	0.531	119	0.632	219	1.163
+502904	99	0.526	110	0.584	209	1.110
+502905	48	0.255	128	0.680	176	0.935

TABLE #1 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	TOTAL STUDENT	% TOTAL
503001	55	0.292	65	0.345	120	0.637
503002	61	0.324	53	0.281	114	05
503003	85	0.451	110	0.584	195	1.036
503101	77	0.409	65	0.345	142	0.754
503102	130	0.690	179	0.951	309	1.641
503103	49	0.260	84	0.446	133	0.706
503104	36	0.191	49	0.260	85	0.451
503201	199	1.057	262	1.392	461	2.448
503202	212	1.126	291	1.546	503	2.672
503301	187	0.993	208	1.105	395	2.098
503302	309	1.641	476	2.528	785	4.169
503303	181	0.961	257	1.365	438	2.326
503400	166	0.882	118	0.627	284	1.508
503501	194	1.030	177	0.940	371	1.970
503502	91	0.483	123	0.653	214	1.137
503503	134	0.712	166	0.882	300	1.593
503601	35	0.186	29	0.154	64	0.340
503602	34	0.181	33	0.175	67	0.356
503701	135	0.717	134	0.712	269	1.429
503702	72	0.382	65	0.345	137	0.728
503703	46	0.244	29	0.154	75	0.398
503800	144	0.765	202	1.073	346	1.838
503900	119	0.632	120	0.637	239	1.269
504000	108	0.574	106	0.563	214	1.137
504100	103	0.547	149	0.791	252	1.338
504200	124	0.659	125	0.664	249	1.322
504301	106	0.563	235	1.248	341	1.811
504302	293	1.556	477	2.533	770	4.090
504401	95	0.505	132	0.701	227	1.206
504402	76	0.404	83	0.441	159	0.844
504403	177	0.940	223	1.184	400	2.124

TABLE #1 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	TOTAL STUDENT	% TOTAL
504404	113	0.600	236	1.253	349	1.854
504501	73	0.388	110	0.584	183	0.972
504502	51	0.271	112	0.595	163	0.866
+505000	3	0.016	16	0.085	19	0.101
505100	40	0.212	48	0.255	88	0.467
+505203	15	0.080	28	0.149	43	0.228
505800	70	0.372	66	0.351	136	0.722
511901	38	0.202	54	0.287	92	0.489
+511902	219	1.163	318	1.689	537	2.852
512001	307	1.631	556	2.953	863	4.584
512002	110	0.584	232	1.232	342	1.816
+512003	394	2.093	748	3.973	1,142	6.065
512004	196	1.041	460	2.443	656	3.484
TOTAL	7,330	38.931	9,901	52.584	17,231	91.515

+ A portion of this census tract is estimated as included within District's boundaries.

TABLE #2

TOTAL DAY AND EVENING STUDENTS ATTENDING
SAN JOSE COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT AND RESIDING OUTSIDE
DISTRICT'S BOUNDARIES IN SANTA CLARA COUNTY AND OUTSIDE COUNTY
SANTA CLARA COUNTY

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	# TOTAL	% TOTAL
502101	7	0.037	14	0.074	21	0.112
502200	9	0.048	24	0.127	33	0.175
502701	5	0.027	8	0.042	13	0.069
502702	5	0.027	24	0.127	29	0.154
502800	3	0.016	27	0.143	30	0.159
502901	8	0.042	18	0.096	26	0.138
502906	6	0.032	13	0.069	19	0.101
504405	1	0.005	4	0.021	5	0.027
504601	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
504602	1	0.005	6	0.032	7	0.037
504801	2	0.011	9	0.048	11	0.058
504802	0	0.000	1	0.005	1	0.005
505201	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
505202	2	0.011	11	0.058	13	0.069
505031	2	0.011	17	0.090	19	0.101
505302	0	0.000	10	0.053	10	0.053
505303	6	0.032	15	0.080	21	0.112
505304	3	0.016	6	0.032	9	0.048
505305	1	0.005	6	0.032	7	0.037
505401	2	0.011	5	0.027	7	0.037
505402	1	0.005	5	0.027	6	0.032
505403	3	0.016	8	0.042	11	0.058
505500	7	0.037	8	0.042	15	0.080
505600	4	0.021	7	0.037	11	0.058
505700	4	0.021	6	0.032	10	0.053
505900	16	0.085	25	0.133	41	0.218
506000	2	0.011	8	0.042	10	0.053
506101	0	0.000	9	0.048	9	0.048
506102	1	0.005	10	0.053	11	0.058
506103	4	0.021	10	0.053	14	0.074
506201	4	0.021	42	0.223	46	0.244
506202	17	0.090	13	0.069	30	0.159

TABLE #2 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	# TOTAL	% TOTAL
506301	7	0.037	15	0.080	22	0.117
506302	3	0.016	19	0.101	22	0.117
506303	8	0.042	28	0.149	36	0.191
506401	8	0.042	12	0.064	20	0.106
506402	6	0.032	13	0.069	19	0.101
506501	7	0.037	23	0.122	30	0.159
506502	3	0.016	11	0.058	14	0.074
506503	6	0.032	22	0.117	28	0.149
506601	3	0.016	19	0.101	22	0.117
506602	3	0.016	29	0.154	32	0.170
506603	7	0.037	13	0.069	20	0.106
506604	3	0.016	20	0.106	23	0.122
506701	4	0.021	10	0.053	14	0.074
506702	4	0.021	16	0.085	20	0.106
506703	1	0.005	9	0.048	10	0.053
506801	8	0.042	12	0.064	20	0.106
506802	6	0.032	24	0.127	30	0.159
506803	8	0.042	22	0.117	30	0.159
506804	4	0.021	10	0.053	14	0.074
506[illegible]0	7	0.037	16	0.085	23	0.122
507000	3	0.016	9	0.048	12	0.064
507100	5	0.027	11	0.058	16	0.085
507201	6	0.032	12	0.064	18	0.096
507202	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
507301	2	0.011	7	0.037	9	0.048
507302	2	0.011	10	0.053	12	0.064
507401	2	0.011	3	0.016	5	0.027
507402	1	0.005	3	0.016	4	0.021
507500	2	0.011	6	0.032	8	0.042
507600	2	0.011	4	0.021	6	0.032
507701	0	0.000	8	0.042	8	0.042

TABLE #2 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	# TOTAL	% TOTAL
507702	1	0.005	7	0.037	8	0.042
507703	0	0.000	5	0.027	5	0.027
507801	1	0.005	9	0.048	10	0.053
507802	2	0.011	12	0.064	14	0.074
507901	6	0.032	9	0.048	15	0.080
507902	1	0.005	10	0.053	11	0.058
508001	2	0.011	12	0.064	14	0.074
508002	3	0.016	14	0.074	17	0.090
508101	2	0.011	5	0.027	7	0.037
508102	3	0.016	3	0.016	6	0.032
508201	1	0.005	16	0.085	17	0.090
508202	4	0.021	14	0.074	18	0.096
508301	0	0.000	6	0.032	6	0.032
508302	1	0.005	10	0.053	11	0.058
508401	4	0.021	7	0.037	11	0.058
508402	3	0.016	10	0.053	13	0.069
508501	1	0.005	9	0.048	10	0.053
508502	8	0.042	14	0.074	22	0.117
508600	1	0.005	11	0.058	12	0.064
508701	0	0.000	5	0.027	5	0.027
508702	1	0.005	1	0.005	2	0.011
508703	1	0.005	4	0.021	5	0.027
508800	0	0.000	5	0.027	5	0.027
508900	1	0.005	10	0.053	11	0.058
509000	0	0.000	6	0.032	6	0.032
509101	6	0.032	17	0.090	23	0.122
509102	1	0.005	3	0.016	4	0.021
509103	1	0.005	10	0.053	11	0.058
509200	2	0.011	6	0.032	8	0.042
509301	1	0.005	7	0.037	8	0.042
509302	1	0.005	8	0.042	9	0.048
509400	1	0.005	9	0.048	10	0.053
509500	1	0.005	5	0.027	6	0.032

TABLE #2 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	# TOTAL	% TOTAL
509600	0	0.000	1	0.005	1	0.005
509700	0	0.000	2	0.011	2	0.011
509801	1	0.005	8	0.042	9	0.048
509802	3	0.016	2	0.011	5	0.027
509901	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
509902	0	0.000	5	0.027	5	0.027
510001	3	0.016	6	0.032	9	0.048
510002	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
510100	2	0.011	3	0.016	5	0.027
510200	0	0.000	2	0.011	2	0.011
510300	1	0.005	3	0.016	4	0.021
510400	0	0.000	4	0.021	4	0.021
510500	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
510600	0	0.000	4	0.021	4	0.021
510700	2	0.011	3	0.016	5	0.027
510801	0	0.000	2	0.011	2	0.011
510802	0	0.000	1	0.005	1	0.005
510803	1	0.005	1	0.005	2	0.011
510900	1	0.005	1	0.005	2	0.011
511000	0	0.000	4	0.021	4	0.021
511100	0	0.000	5	0.027	5	0.027
511200	1	0.005	1	0.005	2	0.011
511300	4	0.021	7	0.037	11	0.058
511400	1	0.005	0	0.000	1	0.005
511500	1	0.005	6	0.032	7	0.037
511600	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
511702	1	0.005	0	0.000	1	0.005
511703	2	0.[illegible]	1	0.005	3	0.016
511704	1	0.005	3	0.016	4	0.021
511800	3	0.016	16	0.085	19	0.101
512100	0	0.000	2	0.011	2	0.011
512300	1	0.005	14	0.074	15	0.080

TABLE #2 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	# TOTAL	% TOTAL
512400	1	0.005	3	0.016	4	0.021
512500	1	0.005	11	0.058	12	0.064
512600	3	0.016	14	0.074	17	0.090
512700	0	0.000	3	0.016	3	0.016
TOTAL	352	1.862	1,223	6.492	1.575	8.362

OUTSIDE OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY

CENSUS TRACT	# DAY	% DAY	# EVENING	% EVENING	# TOTAL	% TOTAL
0	5	0.027	16	0.085	21	0.112
4300	1	0.005	0	0.000	1	0.005
TOTAL	6	0.032	16	0.085	22	0.117

Tables 3,4, and 5 respectively, summarize the breakdown of day, evening, and total students by college attended and resident locations. There was a total of 7,688 (41%) day students and 11,140 (59%) evening students for the District. Of the day students, 4,809 (62.6%) attended San Jose City; 2,178 (28.3%) attended Evergreen Valley; and 701 (9.1%) concurrently attended both colleges. For the evening students, 8,934 (80.2%) attended San Jose City; 1.903 (17.1%) attended Evergreen Valley; and 303 (2.7%) attended both colleges concurrently.

TABLE #3

BREAKDOWN OF DAY STUDENTS BY
COLLEGE ATTENDED AND BY RESIDENCE LOCATIONS

RESIDENCE	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE		EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE		CONCURRENT		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
DISTRICT	4,540	59.05	2,111	27.46	679	8.83	7,330	95.34
COUNTY	264	3.43	66	0.86	22	0.29	352	4.58
OUT OF COUNTY	5	0.07	1	0.01	0	0.00	6	0.08
TOTAL	4,809	62.55	2,178	28.33	701	9.12	7,688	100.00

TABLE #4

BREAKDOWN OF EVENING STUDENTS BY
COLLEGE ATTENDED AND RESIDENCE LOCATIONS
SPRING 1976

RESIDENCE	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE		EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE		CONCURRENT		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
DISTRICT	7,758	69.64	1,846	16.57	297	2.67	9,901	88.88
COUNTY	1,164	10.45	53	0.48	6	0.05	1,223	10.98
OUT OF COUNTY	12	0.11	4	0.04	0	0.00	16	0.15
TOTAL	8,934	80.20	1,903	17.09	303	2.72	11,140	100.01

TABLE #5

BREAKDOWN OF TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT BY
COLLEGE ATTENDED AND RESIDENCE LOCATIONS
SPRING 1976

RESIDENCE	DAY		EVENING		TOTAL	
	#	%	#	%	#	%
DISTRICT	7,330	38.93	9,901	52.58	17,231	91.51
COUNTY	352	1.87	1,223	6.50	1,575	8.37
OUT OF COUNTY	6	0.03	16	0.09	22	0.12
TOTAL	7,688	40.83	11,140	59.17	18,828	100.00

B. "College Service Area"

Table 6 defines the college service area for day students as determined from Method "B". In this method, the census tract is awarded to San Jose City or Evergreen Valley College's service area by the relative importance of its students to the day enrollment. Viewing Table 6, one can see that the college with the highest percentage is awarded that census tract as part of its service area. For example, census tract 503201 had 107 San Jose day students which was 2.36% of its total day students and 76 Evergreen Valley students which was 3.60% of Evergreen Valley's total day enrollment. Census tract 503201 was considered to be in Evergreen Valley College's service area. Table 6 is graphically displayed in Map I.

Upon examining Map I, it becomes clear that for the most part, students attend the college which is closest to home. The majority of students who attended day session at Evergreen Valley came from the eastern portion of the district (Evergreen, Edenvale, Mt. Pleasant, Franklin-McKinley or the East Side Union High School District area.) The day students who attended San Jose City resided in the western, northern and southern portion of the District. (San Jose, New Almaden, Alum Rock and portions of Berryessa and Milpitas or the San Jose Unified and Milpitas High School District area.)

TABLE #6

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA FOR DAY
STUDENTS BY COLLEGE AND CENSUS TRACTS

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA	CENSUS TRACT	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE # DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE # DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY	CONCURRENT # DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY	TOTAL DISTRICT # DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY
SJCC	500100	47	1.04	9	0.43	2	0.29	58	0.79
SJCC	500200	31	0.68	3	0.14	1	0.15	35	0.48
SJCC	500300	36	0.79	4	0.19	0	0.00	40	0.55
SJCC	500400	37	0.81	2	0.09	1	0.15	40	0.55
SJCC	500500	54	1.19	6	0.28	2	0.29	62	0.85
SJCC	500600	57	1.26	5	0.24	2	0.29	64	0.87
SJCC	500700	20	0.44	0	0.00	7	1.03	27	0.37
SJCC	500800	29	0.64	1	0.05	4	0.59	34	0.46
SJCC	500900	63	1.39	15	0.71	2	0.29	80	1.09
SJCC	501000	55	1.21	5	0.24	3	0.44	63	0.86
SJCC	501100	68	1.50	18	0.85	16	2.36	102	1.39
SJCC	501200	46	1.01	13	0.62	10	1.47	69	0.94
SJCC	501300	96	2.11	9	0.43	0	0.00	105	1.43
SJCC	501400	41	0.90	18	0.85	9	1.33	68	0.93
EVC	501500	31	0.68	16	0.76	5	0.74	52	0.71
SJCC	501600	72	1.59	12	0.57	0	0.00	84	1.15
SJCC	501700	36	0.79	2	0.09	6	0.88	44	0.60
SJCC	501800	75	1.65	3	0.14	6	0.88	84	1.15
SJCC	501900	29	0.64	4	0.19	3	0.44	36	0.49
SJCC	502000	89	1.96	6	0.28	9	1.33	104	1.42
SJCC	502102	38	0.84	3	0.14	7	1.03	48	0.65
SJCC	502300	58	1.28	3	0.14	5	0.74	66	0.90
SJCC	502400	74	1.63	9	0.43	3	0.44	86	1.17
SJCC	502500	74	1.63	24	1.14	4	0.59	102	1.39
SJCC	502600	8	0.18	3	0.14	0	0.00	11	0.15
SJCC	502902	49	1.08	4	0.19	4	0.59	57	0.78
SJCC	502903	67	1.48	26	1.23	7	1.03	100	1.36
SJCC	502904	85	1.87	10	0.47	4	0.59	99	1.35
SJCC	502905	38	0.84	7	0.33	3	0.44	48	0.65
SJCC	503001	43	0.95	9	0.43	3	0.44	55	0.75
SJCC	503002	49	1.08	6	0.28	6	0.88	61	0.83

TABLE #6 - (Continued)

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA	CENSUS TRACT	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE # DAY	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE % OF TOTAL DAY	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE # DAY	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE % OF TOTAL DAY	CONCURRENT # DAY	CONCURRENT % OF TOTAL DAY	TOTAL DISTRICT # DAY	TOTAL DISTRICT % OF TOTAL DAY
SJCC	503003	68	1.50	13	0.62	4	0.59	85	1.16
SJCC	503101	58	1.28	13	0.62	6	0.88	77	1.05
SJCC	503102	82	1.81	30	1.42	18	2.65	130	1.77
SJCC	503103	34	0.75	10	0.47	5	0.74	49	0.67
SJCC	503104	28	0.62	6	0.28	2	0.29	36	0.49
EVC	503201	107	2.36	76	3.60	16	2.36	199	2.71
EVC	503202	85	1.87	105	4.97	22	3.24	212	2.89
EVC	503301	65	1.43	80	3.79	42	6.19	187	2.55
EVC	503302	84	1.95	176	8.34	49	7.22	309	4.22
EVC	503303	31	0.68	134	6.35	16	2.36	181	2.47
SJCC	503400	101	2.22	43	2.04	22	3.24	166	2.26
EVC	503501	113	2.49	55	2.61	26	3.83	194	2.65
EVC	503502	38	0.84	37	1.75	16	2.36	91	1.24
EVC	503503	65	1.43	48	2.27	21	3.09	134	1.83
SJCC	503601	26	0.57	8	0.38	1	0.15	35	0.48
EVC	503602	17	0.37	14	0.66	3	0.44	34	0.46
SJCC	503701	84	1.85	27	1.28	24	3.53	135	1.84
SJCC	503702	45	0.99	18	0.85	9	1.33	72	0.98
EVC	503703	17	0.37	13	0.62	16	2.36	46	0.63
EVC	503800	80	1.76	49	2.32	15	2.21	144	1.96
EVC	503900	60	1.32	39	1.85	20	2.95	119	1.62
EVC	504000	60	1.32	36	1.71	12	1.77	108	1.47
EVC	504100	50	1.10	34	1.61	19	2.80	103	1.41
EVC	504200	57	1.36	57	2.70	10	1.47	124	1.69
SJCC	504301	74	1.63	27	1.28	5	0.74	106	1.45
EVC	504302	184	4.05	92	4.36	17	2.50	293	4.00
SJCC	504401	71	1.56	18	0.95	6	0.88	95	1.30
SJCC	504402	47	1.04	21	0.99	8	1.18	76	1.04
SJCC	504403	118	2.60	47	2.23	12	1.77	177	2.41
EVC	504404	74	1.63	37	1.75	2	0.29	113	1.54
SJCC	504501	50	1.10	19	0.90	4	0.59	73	1.00

TABLE #6 - (Continued)

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA	CENSUS TRACT	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE # DAY	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE % OF TOTAL DAY	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE # DAY	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE % OF TOTAL DAY	CONCURRENT # DAY	CONCURRENT % OF TOTAL DAY	TOTAL DISTRICT # DAY	TOTAL DISTRICT % OF TOTAL DAY
SJCC	504502	35	0.77	14	0.66	2	0.29	51	0.70
SJCC	505000	3	0.07	0	0.00	0	0.00	3	0.04
SJCC	505100	37	0.81	1	0.05	2	0.29	40	0.55
SJCC	505203	12	0.26	2	0.09	1	0.15	15	0.20
SJCC	505800	62	1.37	6	0.28	2	0.29	70	0.95
SJCC	511901	29	0.64	6	0.28	3	0.44	38	0.52
SJCC	511902	153	3.37	50	2.37	16	2.36	219	2.99
EVC	512001	167	3.68	110	5.21	30	4.42	307	4.19
EVC	512002	44	0.97	56	2.65	10	1.47	110	1.50
EVC	512003	214	4.71	163	7.72	17	2.50	394	5.38
EVC	512004	116	2.56	66	3.13	14	2.06	196	2.67
TOTAL		4,540	100.00	2,111	99.98	679	99.99	7,330	99.99



MAP I:
COLLEGE SERVICE AREA FOR DAY STUDENTS (SPRING 1976)

EVC
SJCC

Table 7 enumerates the census tracts which make up the first Quartile range (Q1) of day students by college of attendance. In other words, the census tracts in this range were the most important ones in terms of contributing approximately 25% of the entire day enrollment for San Jose City and Evergreen Valley Colleges. The results show that some of the same census tracts were important in contributing students to both San Jose City and Evergreen Valley Colleges. For example, the following census tracts appear on both college's list:

Census Tract	Location
512003	Blossom Hill Road, Metcalf Road, Snell Road
512001	Capitol Expressway, Monterey Road, Blossom Hill Road Almaden Expressway, Guadalupe River

Map II, displays the geographical location of the census tracts in the first quartile range for both colleges. Examining the map, one can see tracts that are most important in contributing day students to both colleges are to be found in the eastern and southern portions of the District. (Eastern portion of Milpitas, Berryessa, Evergreen, Edenvale, New Almaden.) These for the most part are the larger tracts in the newer developed areas.

Comparing Map I and Map II, we see that although tracts 512001, 512003, 512004, 503201 are considered to be relatively more important to Evergreen Valley College in terms of Evergreen's total enrollment, they in actuality contribute large numbers of students to both San Jose City and Evergreen Valley College.

The service area for evening students is shown in Table 8 and displayed in Map III. The picture for evening students is similar to that of day students with the exception of a few tracts which are now included in the San Jose City College's service area:

Census Tract	Location
512004	Blossom Hill Road, Snell Road, Quadalupe River
512003	Blossom Hill Road, Metcalfe Road, Snell Road

TABLE #7

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF DAY STUDENTS
BY CENSUS TRACTS AND COLLEGE

SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF TOTAL DAY	RANK
512003	214	4.71	1
504302	184	4.05	2
512001	167	3.68	3
511902	153	3.37	4
504403	118	2.60	5
512004	116	2.56	6
503501	113	2.49	7
503201	107	2.36	8
TOTAL	1,172	25.82	

EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF TOTAL DAY	RANK
503302	176	8.34	1
512003	163	7.72	2
503303	134	6.35	3
512001	110	5.21	4
TOTAL	583	27.62	

CONCURRENT

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF TOTAL DAY	RANK
503302	49	7.22	1
503301	42	6.19	2
512001	30	4.42	3
503501	26	3.83	4
503701	24	3.53	5
TOTAL	171	25.19	



MAP II:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF DAY STUDENTS BY COLLEGE

- EVC
- SJCC
- EVC & SJCC

TABLE #8

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA FOR
EVENING STUDENTS BY COLLEGE AND CENSUS TRACTS

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA	CENSUS TRACTS	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE # EVENING	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE % EVENING	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE # EVENING	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE % EVENING	CONCURRENT # EVENING	CONCURRENT % EVENING	DISTRICT TOTAL # EVENING	DISTRICT TOTAL % EVENING
SJCC	500100	67	0.86	4	0.22	3	1.01	74	0.75
SJCC	500200	65	0.84	0	0.00	0	0.00	65	0.66
SJCC	500300	32	0.41	3	0.16	0	0.00	35	0.35
SJCC	500400	106	1.37	1	0.05	1	0.34	108	1.09
SJCC	500500	67	0.86	4	0.22	1	0.34	72	0.73
SJCC	500600	77	0.99	3	0.16	0	0.00	80	0.81
SJCC	500700	26	0.34	1	0.05	0	0.00	27	0.27
SJCC	500800	32	0.41	0	0.00	2	0.67	34	0.34
SJCC	500900	54	0.70	8	0.43	0	0.00	62	0.63
SJCC	501000	51	0.66	4	0.22	1	0.34	56	0.57
SJCC	501100	88	1.13	15	0.81	6	2.02	109	1.10
SJCC	501200	51	0.66	5	0.27	2	0.67	58	0.59
SJCC	501300	57	0.73	8	0.43	0	0.00	65	0.66
SJCC	501400	47	0.61	8	0.43	1	0.34	56	0.57
SJCC	501500	57	0.73	11	0.60	3	1.01	71	0.72
SJCC	501600	84	1.08	9	0.49	2	0.67	95	0.96
SJCC	501700	48	0.62	3	0.16	0	0.00	51	0.52
SJCC	501800	86	1.11	4	0.22	0	0.00	90	0.91
SJCC	501900	27	0.35	3	0.16	0	0.00	30	0.30
SJCC	502000	91	1.17	6	0.33	1	0.34	98	0.99
SJCC	502102	30	0.39	3	0.16	1	0.34	34	0.34
SJCC	502300	50	0.64	4	0.22	2	0.67	56	0.57
SJCC	502400	102	1.31	3	0.16	3	1.01	108	1.09
SJCC	502500	111	1.43	5	0.27	1	0.34	117	1.18
SJCC	502600	30	0.39	2	0.11	0	0.00	32	0.32
SJCC	502902	47	0.61	4	0.22	1	0.34	52	0.53
SJCC	502903	112	1.44	7	0.38	0	0.00	119	1.20
SJCC	502904	100	1.29	9	0.49	1	0.34	110	1.11
SJCC	502905	108	1.39	19	1.03	1	0.34	128	1.29
SJCC	503001	61	0.79	4	0.22	0	0.00	65	0.66
SJCC	503002	47	0.61	5	0.27	1	0.34	53	0.54

TABLE #8 - (Continued)

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA	CENSUS TRACTS	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE # EVENING	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE % EVENING	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE # EVENING	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE % EVENING	CONCURRENT # EVENING	CONCURRENT % EVENING	DISTRICT TOTAL # EVENING	DISTRICT TOTAL % EVENING
SJCC	503003	98	1.26	11	0.14	1	0.34	110	1.11
SJCC	503101	51	0.66	9	0.49	5	1.68	65	0.66
EVC	503102	137	1.77	37	2.00	5	1.68	179	1.81
SJCC	503103	78	1.01	6	0.33	0	0.00	84	0.85
SJCC	503104	41	0.53	5	0.27	3	1.01	49	0.49
EVC	503201	196	2.53	57	3.09	9	3.03	262	2.65
EVC	503202	191	2.46	94	5.09	6	2.02	291	2.94
EVC	503301	110	1.42	87	4.71	11	3.70	208	2.09
EVC	503302	253	3.26	193	10.46	30	10.10	476	4.81
EVC	503303	98	1.26	144	7.80	15	5.05	257	2.60
EVC	503400	76	0.98	39	2.11	3	1.01	118	1.19
EVC	503501	124	1.60	52	2.82	1	0.34	177	0.79
EVC	503502	80	1.03	37	2.00	6	2.02	123	1.24
EVC	503503	113	1.46	47	2.55	6	2.02	166	1.67
SJCC	503601	23	0.30	5	0.27	1	0.34	29	0.29
SJCC	503602	27	0.35	6	0.33	0	0.00	33	0.33
EVC	503701	94	1.21	38	2.06	2	0.67	134	1.35
SJCC	503702	53	0.68	11	0.60	1	0.34	65	0.66
EVC	503703	22	0.28	7	0.38	0	0.00	29	0.29
EVC	503800	144	1.86	48	2.60	10	3.37	202	2.04
EVC	503900	90	1.16	28	1.52	2	0.67	120	1.21
EVC	504000	77	0.99	22	1.19	7	2.36	106	1.07
EVC	504100	111	1.43	34	1.84	4	1.35	149	1.50
EVC	504200	95	1.22	24	1.30	6	2.02	125	1.26
EVC	504301	181	2.33	47	2.55	7	2.36	235	2.37
SJCC	504302	385	4.96	75	4.06	17	5.72	477	4.82
SJCC	504401	112	1.44	13	0.70	7	2.36	132	1.33
SJCC	504402	77	0.99	5	0.27	1	0.34	83	0.84
SJCC	504403	187	2.41	27	1.46	9	3.03	223	2.25
SJCC	504404	204	2.63	26	1.41	6	2.02	236	2.38
SJCC	504501	98	1.26	10	0.01	2	0.67	110	1.11

TABLE #8 - (Continued)

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA	CENSUS TRACT	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE # EVENING	SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE % EVENING	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE # EVENING	EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE % EVENING	CONCURRENT # EVENING	CONCURRENT % EVENING	DISTRICT TOTAL # EVENING	DISTRICT TOTAL % EVENING
SJCC	504502	96	1.24	15	0.81	1	0.34	112	1.13
SJCC	505000	16	0.21	0	0.00	0	0.00	16	0.16
SJCC	505100	44	0.57	2	0.11	2	0.67	48	0.48
SJCC	505203	27	0.35	1	0.05	0	0.00	28	0.28
SJCC	505800	60	0.01	4	0.22	2	0.67	66	0.67
SJCC	511901	48	0.62	3	0.16	3	1.01	54	0.55
SJCC	511902	283	3.65	30	1.63	5	1.68	318	3.21
EVC	512001	426	5.49	110	5.96	20	6.73	556	5.62
EVC	512002	155	2.00	68	3.68	9	3.03	232	2.34
SJCC	512003	585	7.54	133	7.20	30	10.10	748	7.55
SJCC	512004	381	4.91	71	3.85	8	2.69	460	4.65
TOTAL		7,758	99.24	1,846	99.02	297	100.01	9,901	100.00



MAP III:

COLLEGE SERVICE AREA FOR EVENING STUDENTS (SPRING 1976)

EVC

SJCC

Table 9 lists the census tracts in the first quartile range for evening students by college of attendance. These data are illustrated in Map IV. Here again, we find tract 512003 as being important in contributing evening students to both colleges. The other tracts which supply the most evening students to Evergreen Valley College are as follows:

Census Tract	Location
503302	Capitol Expressway, Quimby Road, Arroyo, Cunningham Avenue
503303	Capitol Expressway, P.G. & E. Moraga-San Mateo-Metcalfe Powerline

The above are two large tracts in the vicinity of Evergreen Valley College.

The census tracts which are most important in contributing students to San Jose City's evening attendance are as follows:

Census Tract	Location
511002	New Almaden
512004	New Almaden
512001	New Almaden
504302	Berryessa

The number and percentage of the day, evening, and total students for the District are given in Table 10. The first Quartile range of total students for the District is tabulated in Table 11. Map V, VI and VII illustrate the census tract in the first quartile range for day students, evening students and total day and evening students respectively.

Viewing the tables and maps, we find that the majority of students in the District resided in the eastern and southern portions of the District (Berryessa, Evergreen, Edenvale and New Almaden.) The census tracts which contribute the largest number of student to the District are as follows:

Census Tract	Location
512003	Blossom Hill Road, Metcalfe Road, Santa Clara Water Canal, Snell Road

Census Tract	Location
512001	Capitol Expressway, Monterey Road, Blossom Hill Road Almaden Expressway
503302	Cunningham Avenue, Arroyo Aguague, Quimby Road, Aborn Road, Capitol Expressway
504302	Cropley Avenue, Piedmont Road, Berryessa Creek, Sinclair Freeway
512004	Blossom Hill Road, Santa Clara Valley Water District Canal, Snell Road, Almaden Expressway
511902	Coleman Road, Almaden Reservoir, Guadalupe Reservoir

The above information is identical to the results obtained in the previous study entitled Student Residence Locations and Socio-Economic Census Data of the San Jose Community College District.

TABLE #9

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF EVENING STUDENTS
BY CENSUS TRACTS AND COLLEGE

SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF TOTAL DAY	RANK
512003	585	7.54	1
512001	426	5.49	2
504302	385	4.96	3
512004	381	4.91	4
511902	283	3.65	5
TOTAL	2,060	26.55	

EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF TOTAL DAY	RANK
503302	193	10.46	1
503303	144	7.80	2
512003	133	7.20	3
TOTAL	470	25.46	

CONCURRENT

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF TOTAL DAY	RANK
512003	30	10.10	1
503302	30	10.10	2
512001	20	6.73	3
TOTAL	80	26.93	



MAP IV:
FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF
EVENING STUDENTS BY COLLEGE

EVC
SJCC
EVC & SJCC

TABLE #10

DAY, EVENING AND TOTAL STUDENTS
FOR DISTRICT BY CENSUS TRACT

CENSUS TRACTS	# DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY	# EVENING	% OF TOTAL EVENING	# TOTAL STUDENT	% OF TOTAL STUDENT
500100	58	0.79	74	0.75	132	0.77
500200	35	0.48	65	0.66	100	0.57
500300	40	0.55	35	0.35	75	0.45
500400	40	0.55	108	1.09	148	0.86
500500	62	0.85	72	0.73	134	0.78
500600	64	0.87	80	0.81	144	0.84
500700	27	0.37	27	0.27	54	0.31
500800	34	0.46	34	0.34	68	0.39
500900	80	1.09	62	0.63	142	0.82
501000	63	0.86	56	0.57	119	0.69
501100	102	1.39	109	1.10	211	1.22
501200	69	0.94	58	0.59	127	0.74
501300	105	1.43	65	0.66	170	0.99
501400	68	0.93	56	0.57	124	0.72
501500	52	0.71	71	0.72	123	0.71
501600	84	1.15	95	0.96	179	1.04
501700	44	0.60	51	0.52	95	0.55
501800	84	1.15	90	0.91	174	1.01
501900	36	0.49	30	0.30	66	0.38
502000	104	1.42	98	0.99	202	1.17
502100	48	0.65	34	0.34	82	0.48
502300	66	0.90	56	0.57	122	0.71
502400	86	1.17	108	1.09	194	1.13
502500	102	1.39	117	1.18	219	1.27
502600	11	0.15	32	0.32	43	0.25
502902	57	0.78	52	0.53	109	0.63
502903	100	1.36	119	1.20	219	1.27
502904	99	1.35	110	1.11	209	1.21
502905	48	0.65	128	1.29	176	1.02
503001	55	0.75	65	0.66	120	0.70
503002	61	0.83	53	0.54	114	0.66

TABLE #10 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACTS	# DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY	# EVENING	% OF TOTAL EVENING	# TOTAL STUDENT	% OF TOTAL STUDENT
503003	85	1.16	110	1.11	195	1.13
503101	77	1.05	65	0.66	142	0.82
503102	130	1.77	179	1.81	309	1.79
503103	49	0.67	84	0.85	133	0.77
503104	36	0.49	49	0.49	85	0.49
503201	199	2.71	262	2.65	461	2.68
503202	212	2.89	291	2.94	503	2.92
503301	187	2.55	208	2.09	395	2.29
503302	309	4.22	476	4.81	785	4.56
503303	181	2.47	257	2.60	438	2.54
503400	166	2.26	118	1.19	284	1.65
503501	194	2.65	177	1.78	371	2.15
503502	91	1.24	123	1.24	214	1.24
503503	134	1.83	166	1.67	300	1.74
503601	35	0.48	29	0.29	64	0.37
503602	34	0.46	33	0.33	67	0.39
503701	135	1.84	134	1.35	269	1.56
502702	72	0.98	65	0.66	137	0.80
503703	46	0.63	29	0.29	75	0.44
503800	144	1.96	202	2.04	346	2.01
503900	119	1.62	120	1.21	239	1.39
504000	108	1.47	106	1.07	214	1.24
504100	103	1.41	149	1.50	252	1.46
504200	124	1.69	125	1.26	249	1.45
504301	106	1.45	235	2.37	341	1.98
505302	293	4.00	477	4.82	770	4.47
504401	95	1.30	132	1.33	227	1.32
504402	76	1.04	83	0.84	159	0.92
504403	177	2.41	223	2.25	400	2.32
504404	113	1.54	236	2.38	349	2.03
504501	73	1.00	110	1.11	183	1.06

TABLE #10 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACTS	# DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY	# EVENING	% OF TOTAL EVENING	# TOTAL STUDENT	% OF TOTAL STUDENT
504502	51	0.70	112	1.13	163	0.95
505000	3	0.04	16	0.16	19	0.11
505100	40	0.55	48	0.48	88	0.51
505203	15	0.20	28	0.28	43	0.25
505800	70	0.95	66	0.67	136	0.79
511901	38	0.52	54	0.55	92	0.53
511902	219	2.99	318	3.21	537	3.12
512001	307	4.19	556	5.62	863	5.01
512002	110	1.50	232	2.34	342	1.98
512003	394	5.38	748	7.55	1,142	6.63
512004	196	2.67	460	4.65	656	3.81
TOTAL	7,330	99.99	9,901	99.98	17,231	100.01

TABLE #11

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF DAY, EVENING AND TOTAL STUDENTS FOR DISTRICT BY CENSUS TRACTS

	DAY		
CENSUS TRACTS	# DAY	% OF TOTAL DAY	RANK
512003	394	5.38	1
503302	309	4.22	2
512001	307	4.19	3
504302	293	4.00	4
511902	219	2.99	5
503202	212	2.89	6
503201	199	2.71	7
TOTAL	1,933	26.38	

	EVENING		
CENSUS TRACTS	# EVENING	% OF TOTAL EVENING	RANK
512003	748	7.55	1
512001	556	5.62	2
504302	477	4.82	3
503302	476	4.81	4
512004	460	4.65	5
TOTAL	2,717	27.45	

	TOTAL DAY AND EVENING		
CENSUS TRACTS	# TOTAL	% OF TOTAL	RANK
512003	1,142	6.63	1
512001	863	5.01	2
503302	785	4.56	3
504302	770	4.47	4
512004	656	3.81	5
511902	537	3.12	6
TOTAL	4,753	27.60	



MAP V:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF DAY STUDENTS FOR DISTRICT



MAP VI:
FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF EVENING STUDENTS FOR DISTRICT



MAP VII:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF TOTAL DAY AND EVENING STUDENTS FOR DISTRICT

C. Census Data

The information in this section is based upon the special 1975 census data for Santa Clara County. Wherever possible, comparisons are made between 1970 and 1975[2] census data and trend analyses are performed.

1. Race Data

Table 12 describes the number and percentage of household population by racial background for the 73 census tracts in the District. The breakdown of the racial population for 1975 is summarized below and compared to the 1970 figures:

	DISTRICT 1970[3]		DISTRICT 1975	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
White	246,181	65.0%	300,899	66.18%
Mexican Descent			79,069	17.39%
Spanish Heritage			9,346	2.06%
Filipino			5,929	1.30%
Spanish Speaking Language	104,076	28.3%		
Black	12,731	3.3%	20,271	4.46%
Japanese			6,204	1.36%
Chinese (Oriental)	11,341	3.0%	3,979	0.88%
American Indian	N/A	N/A	2,297	0.51%
Other	5,368	1.5%	14,747	3.25%
Unknown	N/A	N/A	11,902	2.62%
Total	379,697	101.1%	454,650	100.01%

2. April 1, 1975 Run #1

3. The 1970 census data had the racial population defined differently from the 1975 special census. Spanish Speaking Language was used previously, whereas in 1975 it was defined as Mexican descent and Spanish Heritage. There were no Filipino, American Indian, or unknown categories in the 1970 census, and Japanese, and Chinese were known as Oriental.

	COUNTY 1970	
	#	%
White	817,373	76.8%
Spanish Speaking Language	186,525	17.5%
Black	18,090	1.7%
Oriental	31,874	2.0%
Other	10,852	1.0%
Total	1,067,714	99.0%

	COUNTY 1975	
	#	%
White	879,227	76.83%
Mexican Descent	114,441	10.00%
Spanish Heritage	18,686	1.63%
Black	28,809	2.52%
Japanese	17,627	1.54%
Chinese	11,650	1.02%
Filipino	11,195	.98%
American Indian	4,363	0.03%
Other	28,210	2.47%
Unknown	30,116	2.63%
Total	1,144,324	99.65%

As can be seen from the 1975 census figures, the majority of the District's population is white. The largest minority population is of Mexican Descent (17.39%). Comparing the District's racial population with that of the County, we find that the District has a higher percentage of minority population than the County. (Mexican, Spanish Heritage, Black, Filipino, American Indian.)

It is difficult to compare the 1970 census figures with the 1975 figures, since the racial classifications were changed. However, viewing the census figures for 1970 and 1975 it appears as if there has been a decline in the Mexican descent, Spanish Heritage group. (20.8% in 1975 compared to 28.3% for Spanish Speaking Language 1970.) The problem with making this comparison, is that people are sensitive about identifying their racial backgrounds. It is possible that some of the Mexican American population might have been placed in the White, Other, or Unknown categories.

TABLE 12

HOUSEHOLD POPULATION BY
RACE OR CULTURAL
BACKGROUND FOR CENSUS
TRACTS WITHIN DISTRICT BOUNDARIES
1975

CENSUS TRACTS	TOTAL POPULATION	WHITE	PER-CENT	MEXICAN DESCENT	PER-CENT	SPANISH HERITAGE	PER-CENT	BLACK	PER-CENT	JAPANESE	PER-CENT	CHINESE	PER-CENT	FILIPINO	PER-CENT	AMERICAN INDIAN	PER-CENT	OTHER	PER-CENT	UNKNOWN	PER-CENT
500100	3,610	1,197	33.2	1,240	34.4	157	4.4	131	3.6	372	10.3	47	1.3	79	2.2	33	0.9	281	7.8	73	2.0
500200	2,630	1,485	56.5	614	23.4	50	1.9	60	2.3	196	7.5	34	1.3	59	2.2	14	0.5	80	3.0	38	1.4
500300	2,687	994	37.0	1,273	47.4	92	3.4	47	1.7	53	2.0	3	0.1	34	1.3	27	1.0	65	2.4	99	3.7
500400	2,022	1,575	77.9	242	12.0	50	2.5	17	0.8	23	1.1	15	0.7	8	0.4	15	0.7	43	2.1	14	1.7
500500	3,701	3,030	81.9	327	8.8	56	1.5	18	0.5	45	1.2	19	0.5	5	0.1	6	0.2	42	1.1	153	4.1
500600	3,026	2,259	74.7	402	13.3	93	3.1	18	0.6	14	0.5	14	0.5	29	0.8	10	0.3	62	2.0	125	4.1
500700	1,123	739	65.8	289	25.7	19	1.7	12	1.1	5	0.4	2	0.2	0	0.0	1	0.1	13	1.2	43	3.8
500800	1,516	351	23.2	764	50.4	92	6.1	16	1.1	3	0.2	2	0.1	4	0.3	11	0.7	66	4.4	207	13.7
500900	2,470	1,466	59.4	216	8.7	13	0.5	98	4.0	72	2.9	224	9.1	24	1.0	15	0.6	164	6.6	178	7.2
501000	3,297	1,625	49.3	1,083	32.9	165	5.0	166	5.0	27	0.8	30	0.9	39	1.2	32	1.0	88	2.7	42	1.3
501100	5,286	1,846	34.9	2,129	40.3	208	3.9	187	3.5	240	4.5	62	1.2	175	3.3	32	0.6	310	5.9	47	1.8
501200	3,136	1,264	40.3	1,305	41.6	140	4.5	127	4.0	45	1.4	10	0.3	104	3.3	24	0.8	65	2.1	52	1.7
501300	2,511	1,856	73.9	195	7.8	74	3.0	53	2.1	51	2.0	99	3.9	22	0.9	17	0.7	98	3.9	46	1.8
501400	3,444	1,265	36.7	1,416	41.1	151	4.4	140	4.1	13	0.4	7	0.2	20	0.6	14	0.4	339	9.8	79	2.3
501500	4,234	1,496	35.3	2,124	50.2	111	2.6	181	4.3	24	0.6	20	0.5	32	0.8	32	0.8	147	3.5	67	1.6
501600	4,263	2,862	67.1	594	13.9	58	1.4	215	5.0	93	2.2	177	4.2	36	0.8	24	0.6	171	4.0	35	0.8
501700	3,263	973	29.8	1,873	57.4	108	3.3	60	1.8	15	0.5	8	0.2	3	0.1	15	0.5	141	4.3	67	2.1
501800	4,090	1,869	45.7	1,882	46.0	93	2.3	54	1.3	11	0.3	15	0.8	5	0.1	13	0.3	69	1.7	79	1.9
501900	1,513	922	60.9	400	26.4	38	2.5	29	1.9	6	0.4	8	0.5	10	0.7	5	0.3	52	3.4	43	2.8
502000	2,259	1,525	67.5	399	17.7	83	3.7	47	2.1	10	0.4	8	0.4	6	0.3	15	0.7	85	3.8	81	3.6
502102	560	440	78.6	39	7.0	6	1.1	17	3.0	11	0.2	10	1.8	2	0.4	3	0.5	13	2.3	19	3.4
502300	4,540	3,969	87.4	176	3.9	32	0.7	17	0.3	57	1.3	29	0.6	4	0.1	10	0.2	53	1.2	193	4.3
502400	5,931	4,952	83.5	456	7.7	105	1.8	14	0.2	38	0.6	20	0.3	10	0.2	19	0.3	193	3.3	124	2.1
502500	6,151	5,321	86.5	247	4.0	77	1.3	35	0.6	50	0.8	29	0.5	11	0.2	12	0.2	80	1.3	289	4.7
502600	489	444	91.6	9	1.8	2	0.4	2	0.4	6	1.2	3	0.6	1	0.2	0	0.0	7	1.4	15	3.1
502902	2,111	1,856	87.9	90	4.3	29	1.4	17	0.8	25	1.2	15	0.7	4	0.2	6	0.3	31	1.5	38	1.8
502903	6,554	5,736	87.5	222	3.4	46	0.7	63	1.0	167	2.5	48	0.7	7	0.1	15	0.2	188	2.9	62	0.9

CENSUS TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION	WHITE	PER-CENT	MEXICAN DESCENT	PER-CENT	SPANISH HERITAGE	PER-CENT	BLACK	PER-CENT	JAPANESE	PER-CENT	CHINESE	PER-CENT	FILIPINO	PER-CENT	AMERICAN INDIAN	PER-CENT	OTHER	PER-CENT	UNKNOWN	PER-CENT
502904	3,346	3,116	87.8	96	2.7	34	1.0	32	0.9	51	1.5	21	0.6	9	0.3	10	0.3	55	1.6	123	3.5
502905	3,026	4,270	91.1	221	4.4	61	1.3	44	0.9	74	1.5	25	0.5	15	0.3	44	0.9	82	1.6	172	3.4
503001	4,123	3,780	91.7	104	2.5	24	0.6	23	0.5	35	0.8	33	0.8	1	0.02	13	0.3	71	1.7	63	1.5
503002	3,349	2,951	86.8	123	3.6	58	1.7	54	1.6	35	1.0	32	0.9	12	0.4	3	0.09	78	2.3	93	1.6
503003	5,533	4,780	86.4	282	5.1	44	0.8	48	0.8	110	2.0	52	0.9	17	0.3	13	0.2	134	2.4	51	0.9
503101	4,593	1,931	42.0	1,930	42.0	159	3.5	107	2.3	14	0.3	13	0.3	20	0.4	31	0.7	214	4.7	165	3.6
503102	7,830	3,548	45.3	2,562	32.7	166	2.1	785	10.0	62	0.8	69	0.9	90	1.2	44	0.6	384	4.9	118	1.5
503103	3,959	2,323	58.7	1,019	25.7	52	1.3	123	3.1	21	0.5	4	0.2	10	0.3	38	1.0	74	1.9	293	7.4
503104	4,205	3,617	86.0	282	6.7	31	0.7	66	1.6	20	0.5	23	0.5	4	0.1	13	0.3	69	1.6	69	1.6
503201	12,816	8,128	63.4	2,750	21.5	256	2.0	736	5.7	167	1.3	17	0.1	161	1.3	32	0.2	269	2.1	241	2.0
503202	11,404	6,340	54.2	2,823	24.8	365	3.2	677	5.9	92	0.8	33	0.3	159	1.4	90	0.8	258	2.3	705	6.2
503301	8,752	3,297	37.8	3,298	37.8	237	2.7	949	10.8	61	0.7	27	0.3	172	2.0	69	1.0	234	2.7	325	3.7
503302	12,845	8,445	65.8	1,764	13.8	202	1.6	1,356	10.6	129	0.8	36	0.3	158	1.3	35	0.3	524	4.1	386	1.4
503303	9,427	6,850	72.7	1,010	10.7	141	1.5	385	4.1	100	1.1	34	0.4	151	1.6	14	0.2	239	2.5	496	5.3
503400	7,540	2,841	29.6	2,981	39.3	353	4.7	1,232	16.2	31	0.4	35	0.5	160	2.1	74	1.0	315	4.2	157	2.1
503501	10,380	2,672	25.5	4,691	44.5	385	3.6	1,440	13.6	33	0.3	20	0.2	337	3.6	231	2.2	624	5.9	207	2.0
503502	5,737	2,772	48.3	1,797	31.3	91	1.6	490	8.5	39	0.6	3	0.1	151	2.6	46	0.8	270	4.7	80	1.4
503503	8,740	3,960	45.4	1,934	28.7	166	2.9	760	11.1	43	0.6	43	0.5	85	1.3	38	0.6	374	5.5	234	3.5
503601	2,279	872	38.3	542	23.9	129	5.6	62	2.7	9	0.4	9	0.4	14	0.6	19	0.7	446	19.6	181	7.9
503602	2,450	681	27.8	1,207	48.0	97	4.0	118	4.7	9	0.4	1	0.0	19	0.8	32	1.3	163	6.7	155	6.3
503701	8,612	2,433	28.3	3,549	41.2	277	3.2	1,070	12.4	42	0.5	82	0.9	150	1.7	57	0.7	454	5.3	493	5.7
503702	4,180	487	11.7	2,856	68.3	127	3.0	397	9.5	24	0.6	1	0.0	43	1.0	53	1.3	152	3.6	40	1.0
503703	2,150	476	22.1	992	46.1	37	1.7	435	20.2	2	0.09	11	0.5	39	1.7	12	1.4	85	3.9	22	1.0
503800	9,620	5,457	56.8	1,868	19.4	345	3.6	544	5.7	224	2.3	120	1.2	265	2.8	71	0.7	455	4.7	69	0.7
503900	5,017	2,853	56.9	1,319	26.3	90	1.8	132	2.6	86	1.7	33	0.6	37	0.7	23	0.5	386	7.7	78	1.6
504000	3,909	2,384	60.5	2,412	40.8	191	3.2	523	8.9	35	0.6	20	0.3	71	1.2	14	0.2	181	3.2	68	1.2
504100	6,185	3,897	46.6	2,279	36.9	204	3.3	174	2.8	54	0.9	28	0.4	50	0.8	52	0.8	372	6.0	77	1.2
504200	6,322	5,078	80.3	512	8.1	73	1.2	132	2.1	106	1.7	32	0.5	10	0.2	15	0.2	311	4.9	73	1.2
504301	10,391	7,101	68.3	976	9.4	241	2.3	288	2.8	286	2.8	421	4.1	558	5.4	34	0.3	301	2.9	185	1.8
504302	21,641	15,262	70.5	1,801	8.3	497	2.3	1,179	5.4	556	2.6	341	1.6	645	3.0	80	0.4	798	3.7	480	2.2
504401	6,000	3,643	60.7	792	13.2	91	1.5	721	12.0	43	0.7	39	0.7	171	2.9	53	1.1	277	4.6	154	2.6

CENSUS TRACTS	TOTAL POPULATION	WHITE	PER-CENT	MEXICAN DESCENT	PER-CENT	SPANISH HERITAGE	PER-CENT	BLACK	PER-CENT	JAPANESE	PER-CENT	CHINESE	PER-CENT	FILIPINO	PER-CENT	AMERICAN INDIAN	PER-CENT	OTHER	PER-CENT	UNKNOWN	PER-CENT
504402	4,590	3,547	77.3	310	6.8	73	1.6	259	5.6	35	0.8	46	1.0	67	1.5	34	0.7	95	2.1	124	2.7
504403	11,184	8,301	74.2	974	8.7	239	2.1	439	3.9	116	1.0	145	1.3	217	1.9	124	1.1	194	1.7	435	3.9
504404	10,033	8,048	80.2	643	6.4	152	1.5	407	4.1	113	1.1	52	0.5	156	1.6	42	0.4	172	1.7	248	2.5
504501	5,263	4,168	79.2	425	8.1	112	2.1	144	2.7	32	0.6	23	0.4	62	1.2	51	1.0	110	2.1	136	2.6
504502	4,109	2,776	67.6	296	7.2	124	3.0	278	6.8	50	1.2	47	1.1	266	6.5	16	0.4	141	3.4	113	2.8
505000	2,570	1,950	75.9	210	8.2	58	2.3	97	3.8	43	1.7	18	0.7	46	1.8	15	0.6	101	4.0	32	1.2
505100	1,889	1,085	57.4	458	24.3	36	1.9	35	1.9	120	6.4	20	1.1	44	2.3	4	0.2	81	4.3	6	0.3
505203	780	576	74.1	105	13.5	18	2.3	6	0.8	3	0.4	10	1.3	1	0.1	8	1.0	40	5.1	13	1.7
505800	3,934	3,368	85.6	216	5.5	52	1.3	2	0.1	17	0.4	12	0.3	15	0.4	10	0.3	170	4.3	72	1.8
511901	1,810	1,588	88.6	83	4.5	18	1.0	28	1.5	18	1.0	13	0.7	1	0.05	11	0.6	31	1.7	19	1.0
511902	22,974	21,139	92.0	253	1.1	102	0.4	98	0.4	346	1.5	236	1.0	39	0.2	17	0.05	247	1.1	500	2.2
512001	24,482	20,725	84.7	928	3.8	249	1.0	457	1.9	365	1.5	321	1.3	153	0.6	54	0.2	668	2.7	562	2.3
512002	8,224	6,210	75.5	1,027	12.5	142	1.7	288	3.5	69	0.8	63	0.7	43	0.5	20	0.2	157	1.9	205	2.5
512003	29,659	24,617	83.0	1,664	5.6	408	1.4	549	1.9	434	1.5	228	0.8	137	0.5	92	0.3	624	2.1	906	3.1
512004	13,901	15,699	87.7	724	4.0	182	1.0	221	1.2	184	1.0	124	0.7	66	0.4	44	0.2	330	1.8	337	1.9
DISTRICT TOTAL 1975	454,650	300,899	66.18	79,069	17.39	9,346	2.06	20,271	4.46	6,204	1.36	3,979	0.88	5,829	1.30	2,291	0.51	14,754	3.25	11,402	2.62
COUNTY TOTAL 1975	1,144,324	879,227	76.83	144,441	10.00	18,686	1.63	28,809	2.52	17,627	1.54	11,630	1.02	11,195	0.98	4,363	0.03	28,210	2.47	30,136	2.63
DISTRICT TOTAL 1970 CENSUS	378,697	246,181	65.00	SPANISH SPEAKING LANGUAGES 104,076		28.3		12,731	3.30			ORIENTAL 11,341	3.0					1,368			
COUNTY TOTAL 1970	1,066,714	817,373	76.8	SPANISH SPEAKING LANGUAGES 186,525		17.5		18,090	1.70			ORIENTAL 21,874	2.0					10,852	1.00		

CHANGE 1970-1975	TOTAL POPULATION	PERCENT	WHITE	PERCENT	SSL	PERCENT	BLACK	PERCENT	ORIENTAL	PERCENT	OTHER	PERCENT
	74,967	19.7	61,854	7.6	9,732	9.4	7,540	59.2	2,158	10.2	11,683	2.2

Graph 1 illustrates the comparison of the District's population by race. As can be seen from the graph, the SSL population appears to have declined between 1970-1975.

The geographical areas which have the highest percentage of Mexican Descent and Spanish Heritage populations are enumerated in Table 13 and shown on Map VIII. As can be seen from Map VIII, these areas are to be found in downtown San Jose, Alum Rock, and a portion of Evergreen. These census tracts fall within the lowest quartile of student attendance and for the most part are part of San Jose City College's service area. The same area was found to have a high concentration of Spanish Speaking Language population in the 1970 census.

Table 14 and Map IX describe the area which has the highest concentration of Oriental population. This area is located downtown San Jose and Berryessa. There is a high concentration of District students that reside in Berryessa, but comparatively few are from the downtown San Jose area.

The residential areas which show a high concentration of Black population are listed in Table 15 and Map X. This corresponds to the Alum Rock, Evergreen, and Milpitas areas. These tracts have an average number of San Jose Community College District students residing there.

A high concentration of the Filipino population was found to reside in parts of Milpitas, Berryessa, Evergreen, and Downtown San Jose, (See Table 16, Map XI.) The first quartile range of American Indian population was found to reside in Alum Rock, Evergreen, Milpitas, and parts of downtown San Jose. (See table 17, Map XII.)

Areas designated as high in "Other" population were downtown San Jose, Alum Rock and parts of Evergreen. These areas are also high in Spanish Speaking and Black population and represent tracts where minorities live. (See Table 18, Map XIII.)

Comparison of Household Population by Race for District: 1970 & 1975



Graph I

TABLE #13

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF SPANISH SPEAKING
LANGUAGE POPULATION (MEXICAN DESCENT AND SPANISH HERITAGE)
1975

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF CENSUS TRACTS	RANK	LOCATION
503702	2,983	71.4	1	Alum Rock Ave., Sinclair Freeway, King Rd.
501700	1,981	60.7	2	Auzerais, San Salvador, South First
500800	856	56.5	3	Julian St., W. San Salvador, Market
501500	2,235	52.8	4	San Antonio St., Bayshore Freeway
503602	1,274	52.0	5	Alum Rock, King Rd., Story Rd., Bayshore
501800	1,975	48.3	6	Sinclair, Guadalupe, Willow, Lincoln
503501	5,076	48.0	7	Story Rd., Capitol Expressway, Ocala
503703	1,029	47.9	8	Sinclair Freeway, Jackson Ave., Story Rd.
501200	1,445	46.1	9	Washington St., Coyote Creek
503101	2,089	45.5	10	Willow St., Coyote Creek., Alma Ave.
503701	3,286	44.4	11	Mabury Rd., Sinclair Freeway
TOTAL	24,229			



MAP VIII:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF SPANISH SPEAKING LANGUAGE POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT

TABLE #14

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE
OF ORIENTAL POPULATION
1975

CENSUS TRACTS	#	%	RANK	LOCATION
500900	296	12.0	1	E. Santa Clara St., S. Tenth, William St.
500100	419	11.6	2	Bayshore Freeway, Taylor St., Fourth St.
500200	230	8.7	3	Los Gatos Freeway, Fourth St., N. First, Julian
504301	707	6.8	4	Trimble Rd., Capital Ave., Sinclair, Mabury
501600	270	6.3	5	E. William St., Coyote Creek, Martha St.
501300	150	6.0	6	E. Santa Clara St., Coyote River, E. William St.
501100	302	5.7	7	Taylor Rd., Capitol Ave., Sinclair, Mabury
504302	899	4.1	8	Cropley Ave., Piedmont, Berryessa Creek
TOTAL	3,273			



MAP IX:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF ORIENTAL POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT

TABLE #15

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF BLACK POPULATION
1975

CENSUS	#	%	RANK	LOCATION
503703	435	20.2	1	Sinclair Freeway, Jackson Ave., Story Rd.
503400	1,232	16.2	2	Story Rd., Tully Rd., Bayshore Freeway
503501	1,440	13.6	3	Story Rd., Capitol Expressway, Ocala Ave.
503701	1,070	12.4	4	Mabury Rd., Sinclair Freeway, McKee Rd.
504401	721	12.0	5	County Line, Sinclair Freeway, Calaveras Rd.
503301	998	11.4	6	Tully Rd., Capitol Expressway
TOTAL	5,896			



MAP X:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF BLACK POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT

TABLE #16

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF FILIPINO POPULATION

CENSUS	#	%	RANK	LOCATION
504502	266	6.5	1	Calaveras Blvd., Southern Pacific Railroad
504301	558	5.4	2	Trimble Rd., Sinclair Freeway, Mabury Rd.
503501	377	3.6	3	Story Rd., Capitol Expressway, Ocala Ave.
501100	175	3.3	4	Taylor Rd., Capitol Ave., Sinclair Freeway
501200	104	3.3	5	Washington St., Coyote Creek, N. Tenth St.
504302	645	3.0	6	Copley Ave., Penitencia Creek, Sinclair Freeway
TOTAL	2125			



MAP XI:
FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF FILIPINO POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT

TABLE #17

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF
AMERICAN INDIAN POPULATION
1975

CENSUS TRACTS	#	%	RANK	LOCATION
503703	31	1.4	1	Sinclair Freeway, Jackson Ave., Story Rd.
503602	32	1.3	2	Alum Rock Ave., King Rd., Story Rd.
503702	53	1.3	3	Alum Rock Ave., Sinclair Freeway, King Rd.
503501	131	1.2	4	Story Rd., Capitol Expressway, Ocala Ave.
504401	65	1.1	5	County Line, Sinclair Freeway, Calaveras Blvd.
504403	124	1.1	6	County Line, Calaveras Blvd., Sinclair Freeway
500300	27	1.0	7	Los Gatos Freeway, Guadalupe River, Stockton Ave.
501000	32	1.0	8	Bayshore Freeway, Taylor St., Fourth St.
503103	38	1.0	9	Alma Ave., Senter Rd., Tully Rd.
503301	89	1.0	10	Tully Rd., Capitol Expressway, Bayshore Freeway
503400	74	1.0	11	Story Rd., King Rd., Tully Rd.,
504501	51	1.0	12	County Line, Old Oakland Highway, Calaveras Blvd.
TOTAL	747			



MAP XII:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF
AMERICAN INDIAN POPULATION
BY CENSUS TRACT

TABLE #18

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF "OTHER" POPULATION
1975

CENSUS TRACTS	#	% OF TRACT	RANK	LOCATION
503601	446	19.6	1	Mabury Rd., King Rd., Alum Rock Ave.
501400	339	9.8	2	Bayshore Freeway, San Antonio St.
500100	281	7.8	3	Bayshore Freeway, Taylor St.
503900	386	7.7	4	McKee Rd., Kirk Ave., Alum Rock Ave.
503602	163	6.7	5	Alum Rock Ave., King Rd., Story
500900	164	6.6	6	Santa Clara St., S. Tenth St., N. First St.
504100	372	6.0	7	Alum Rock Ave., Fleming Ave., Story Rd.
501100	310	5.9	8	Taylor St., Bayshore Freeway, N. First St.
503501	624	5.9	9	Story Rd., Capitol Expressway, Ocala Ave.
503503	374	5.5	10	Story Rd., Clayton Rd., White Rd.
503701	454	5.3	11	Mabury Rd., Sinclair Freeway, King Rd.
TOTAL	3,913			



MAP XIII:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF "OTHER" POPULATION BY CENSUS TRACT

2. Population Data

Table 19 describes the percentage change in the total population between 1966-1970, 1970-1975, and 1966-1975, for all of the census tracts within the District. County figures showing percentage change in population are included for comparison. The total percentage growth for the District and County are as follows:

	District	County
1966-1970	26.5%	15.8%
1970-1975	18.9%	8.9%
1966-1975	50.4%	27.1%

Graph 2 illustrates the comparison in growth between the County and the District. The District is increasing in population at a greater rate than the County. However, both County and District have slowed down their growth rate between 1970-1975 as compared to 1966-1970.

Map XIV and XV shows the census tracts which grew or declined in population between 1970-75, and 1966-1975 respectively.

The areas which are increasing in population are parts of Milpitas, Berryessa, Evergreen, Edenvale, and Almaden. The areas declining in population are the western portion of the District, particularly downtown San Jose. From 1970-1975,census tracts 504405, 504403 (Milpitas); 5038, 5039, 5040, 5041 (Alum Rock); 512002 (Edenvale) have dropped in population.

Table 20 enumerates the census tracts with the highest percentage increase in population between 1970-1975. These tracts can be seen graphically displayed in Map XVI. The tracts which had the greatest percentage growth in 1975 are located in Edenvale, Berryessa, North Milpitas, Evergreen and Almaden.

TABLE 19

TOTAL POPULATION CHANGE IN DISTRICT
CENSUS TRACTS BETWEEN 1966-1975

CENSUS TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION 1966	TOTAL POPULATION 1970	TOTAL POPULATION 1975	CHANGE 1966-1970	% CHANGE	CHANGE 1970-1975	% CHANGE	CHANGE 1966-1975	% CHANGE
500100	4,134	3,766	3,610	-368	-8.9	-156	-4.1	-524	-12.7
500200	3,750	4,683	3,511	933	24.9	-1,172	-25.0	-239	-6.4
500300	3,243	3,306	2,698	63	1.9	-608	-18.4	-545	-16.8
500400	2,450	2,338	2,143	-112	-4.6	-195	-8.3	-307	-12.5
500500	4,761	4,260	4,333	-501	-10.5	73	1.7	-428	-9.0
500600	3,511	3,617	3,148	106	3.0	-469	-13.0	-363	-10.3
500700	1,403	1,612	1,145	209	14.9	-467	-29.0	-258	-18.4
500800	4,014	2,905	2,501	-1,109	-27.6	-404	-13.9	-1,513	-37.7
500900	5,055	5,353	4,352	298	5.9	-1,001	-18.7	-703	-13.9
501000	3,276	4,016	3,476	740	22.6	-540	-13.4	200	6.1
501100	5,593	5,695	5,406	102	1.8	-289	-5.1	-187	-3.3
501200	3,453	3,489	3,285	36	1.0	-204	-5.9	-168	-4.9
501300	4,023	4,437	3,719	414	10.3	-718	-16.2	-304	-7.6
501400	3,425	3,816	3,501	391	11.4	-315	-8.2	76	2.2
501500	4,988	5,127	4,296	139	2.8	-831	-16.2	-692	-13.9
501600	5,462	4,832	4,761	-630	-11.5	-71	-1.5	-701	-12.8
501700	3,632	3,728	3,392	96	2.6	-336	-9.0	-240	-6.6
501800	6,072	5,067	4,118	-1,005	-16.6	-949	-18.7	-1,954	-32.2
501900	1,729	1,615	1,513	-114	-6.6	-102	-6.3	-216	-12.5
502000	7,383	7,996	6,835	613	8.3	-1,161	-14.5	-548	-7.4
502102	4,388	5,241	4,497	853	19.4	-744	-14.2	109	2.5
502300	4,928	5,556	5,197	628	12.7	-359	-6.5	269	5.5
502400	6,302	6,391	5,942	89	1.4	-449	-7.0	-360	-5.7
502500	6,719	6,461	6,172	-258	-3.8	-289	-4.5	-547	-8.1
502600	7,279	6,543	7,866	-736	-10.1	1,323	20.2	587	8.1
502902	7,648	9,590	8,454	1,942	25.4	-1,136	-11.9	806	10.5
502903	7,357	6,480	6,562	-877	-11.9	-82	-1.3	-795	-10.8
502904	10,612	10,317	10,654	-295	-2.8	337	3.3	42	0.4
502905	4,380	6,465	6,693	2,085	47.6	228	3.5	2,313	52.8
503001	4,711	4,579	4,229	-132	-2.8	-350	-7.6	-482	-10.2
503002	3,568	4,261	3,448	693	19.4	-813	-19.1	-120	-3.4

TABLE 19 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION 1966	TOTAL POPULATION 1970	TOTAL POPULATION 1975	CHANGE 1966-1970	% CHANGE	CHANGE 1970-1975	% CHANGE	CHANGE 1966-1975	% CHANGE
503003	4,236	5,699	5,538	1,463	34.5	-161	-2.8	1,302	30.7
503101	4,881	4,894	4,593	13	0.3	-301	-6.2	-288	-5.9
503102	3,898	4,736	7,905	838	21.5	3,169	66.9	4,007	102.8
503103	3,434	3,583	3,967	149	4.3	384	10.7	533	15.5
503104	2,261	3,316	4,219	1,055	46.7	903	27.2	1,958	86.6
503201	6,685	12,695	12,836	6,010	89.9	141	1.1	6,151	92.0
503202	7,341	7,779	11,438	438	6.0	3,659	47.0	4,097	55.8
503301	6,488	7,529	8,763	1,041	16.0	1,234	16.4	2,275	35.1
503302	2,592	8,637	12,858	6,045	233.2	4,221	48.9	10,266	396.1
503303	2,071	4,471	9,430	2,400	115.9	4,959	110.9	7,359	355.3
503400	6,181	7,611	7,596	1,430	23.1	-15	-0.2	1,415	22.9
503501	7,155	10,272	10,586	3,117	43.6	314	3.1	3,431	48.0
503502	4,156	4,727	5,737	571	13.7	1,010	21.4	1,581	38.0
503503	6,437	7,280	6,796	843	13.1	-484	-6.7	359	5.6
503601	2,210	2,305	2,293	95	4.3	-12	-0.5	83	3.8
503602	2,629	2,127	2,450	-502	-19.1	323	15.2	-179	-6.8
503701	3,996	6,260	8,967	2,264	56.7	2,707	43.2	4,971	124.4
503702	4,570	4,813	4,202	243	5.3	-611	-12.7	-368	-8.1
503703	2,080	2,404	2,150	324	15.6	-254	-10.6	70	3.4
503800	5,708	6,952	9,693	1,244	21.8	2,741	39.4	3,985	69.8
503900	5,554	5,480	5,059	-74	-1.3	-421	-7.7	-495	-8.9
504000	6,904	6,718	5,909	-186	-2.7	-809	-12.0	-995	-14.4
504100	6,687	6,857	6,199	170	2.5	-658	-9.6	-488	-7.3
504200	5,871	5,891	6,496	20	0.3	605	10.3	625	10.6
504301	2,625	3,349	10,393	724	27.6	7,044	210.3	7,768	295.9
504302	4,946	8,027	21,654	3,081	62.3	13,627	169.8	16,708	337.8
504401	3,954	4,583	6,030	629	15.9	1,447	31.6	2,076	52.5
504402	2,896	2,403	4,597	-493	-17.0	2,194	91.3	1,701	58.7
504403	6,884	11,546	11,197	4,662	67.7	-349	-3.0	4,313	62.7
504404	3,444	7,597	10,038	4,153	120.6	2,441	32.1	6,594	191.5
504501	5,163	5,251	5,264	88	1.7	13	0.2	101	2.0

TABLE 19 -(Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION 1966	TOTAL POPULATION 1970	TOTAL POPULATION 1975	CHANGE 1966-1970	% CHANGE	CHANGE 1970-1975	% CHANGE	CHANGE 1966-1975	% CHANGE
504502	1,503	3,483	4,702	1,980	131.7	1,219	35.0	3,199	212.8
505000	6,213	6,653	7,912	440	7.1	1,259	18.9	1,699	27.3
505100	2,896	3,283	1,889	387	13.4	-1,394	-42.5	-1,007	-34.9
505203	2,383	3,397	2,005	1,014	42.6	-1,392	-41.0	-378	-15.9
505800	4,763	4,841	3,934	78	1.6	-907	-18.7	-829	-17.4
511901	5,323	5,807	5,497	484	9.1	-310	-5.3	174	3.3
511902	6,598	15,125	24,555	8,527	129.2	9,430	62.4	17,957	272.2
512001	2,480	7,637	24,525	5,157	207.9	16,888	221.1	22,045	888.9
512002	4,569	7,129	3,224	2,560	56.0	-3,905	-54.8	-1,345	-29.4
512003	3,388	17,599	33,910	14,211	419.5	16,311	92.7	30,522	900.9
512004	3,369	11,558	17,918	8,189	243.1	6,360	55.0	14,549	431.8
DISTRICT TOTAL	336,671	425,846	506,381	89,175	32.9	80,535	13.4	169,710	64.5
COUNTY TOTAL	919,653	1,064,714	1,169,006	145,061	15.8	104,292	8.9	249,353	27.1
DISTRICT % OF COUNTY	36.6%	40.0%	43.3%						

Comparison of Population Growth Rates in District and County: 1966 - 1975



Graph II



MAP XIV:
CHANGE IN POPULATION, 1970 - 1975

GROWTH
DECLINE



MAP XV:
CHANGE IN POPULATION,
1966 - 1975

GROWTH
DECLINE

TABLE #20

CENSUS TRACTS WITH HIGHEST PERCENTAGE
INCREASE IN POPULATION 1970 - 1975

CENSUS TRACTS	CHANGE	% CHANGE	RANK
512001	16,888	221.1	1
504301	7,044	210.3	2
504302	13,627	169.8	3
503303	4,959	110.9	4
512003	16,311	92.7	5
504402	2,194	91.3	6
503102	3,169	66.9	7
511902	9,430	62.4	8
512004	6,360	55.0	9
503302	4,221	48.9	10
503202	3,659	47.0	11
503701	2,707	43.2	12
505203	1,392	41.0	13
504502	1,219	35.0	14
504404	2,441	32.1	15
504401	1,447	31.6	16
503104	903	27.2	17
503502	1,010	21.2	18



MAP XVI:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF AREAS OF GREATEST GROWTH IN POPULATION, 1970 - 1975

3. Income Data

Table 21 lists household income in 1974 by census tracts. Each tract is rated high, medium or low according to whether there was a majority of households with incomes of $9,999 and less (low); $10,000-$23,999 (medium); or $24,000 + (high).

Most of the District included areas of low or medium income. The two tracts rated as having a majority of households with incomes over $24,000 are 511902 (Almaden) and a portion of 502102 (Sinclair Freeway, Meridian Ave., S.P. Railroad, and S. Bascom Ave.) Other tracts which have a majority of households with medium income, but also have a substantial number of households with incomes over $24,000 are:

Census Tract	Location
504200	Penitencia Creek, Arroyo, Story Rd., Alum Rock Ave.
502902	Meridian, Hillsdale, Leigh, Dry Creek Rd.
502903	Dry Creek Rd., Booksin Ave, Meridian, Hillsdale Ave.
503001	Curtner Ave, Quadalupe River, Koch Lane, Booksin Ave.
503002	Koch Lane, Guadalupe River, Hillsdale Ave., Jarvis Rd.
512003	Blossom Hill Rd., Metcalfe Ave., Snell Rd.

Map XVII "Household Income By Census Tracts Classified High, Medium, Low - 1975 Census" represents Table 21. Viewing the map, one can see that households with low incomes of less than $10,000, reside in the downtown San Jose area, Alum Rock area,and central portion of the District. The area having a majority of households with incomes over $24,000 is to be found in the southern portion of the District (Almaden). The remainder of the District covers areas of medium income.



MAP XVII:

HOUSEHOLD INCOME BY CENSUS TRACT. CLASSIFIED HIGH, MEDIUM, LOW - 1975 CENSUS

HIGH - $24,000+

MEDIUM - $10,000 - $23,999

LOW - BELOW $9,999

TABLE #21

HOUSEHOLDS BY HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN 1974
(APRIL 1, 1975 RUN)

CENSUS TRACTS	TOTAL	9,999 & LESS	%	10,000 TO 23,999	%	24,000 & OVER	%	UNKNOWN	%	INCOME RANGE
500100	1,365	431	31.6	251	18.4	28	2.05	655	48.0	Low
500200	1,297	33[illegible]	25.9	254	19.6	34	2.62	673	51.9	Low
500300	985	432	43.9	199	20.2	16	1.62	338	34.3	Low
500400	937	318	33.9	204	21.8	37	3.95	378	40.3	Low
500500	1,573	361	22.9	351	22.3	151	9.60	710	45.1	Low
500600	1,364	390	28.6	342	25.1	36	2.64	596	43.7	Low
500700	552	205	37.1	97	17.6	4	0.72	246	44.6	Low
500800	560	196	35.0	59	10.5	2	0.36	303	54.0	Low
500900	1,399	746	53.3	126	9.0	4	0.29	523	37.4	Low
501000	1,776	798	44.9	190	10.7	10	0.56	778	43.8	Low
501100	1,914	657	34.3	366	19.1	21	1.10	870	45.5	Low
501200	1,231	475	38.6	203	16.5	21	1.71	532	43.2	Low
501300	1,056	403	38.2	179	17.0	37	3.50	437	41.4	Low
501400	1,401	681	48.6	261	18.6	9	0.64	450	32.1	Low
501500	1,549	588	37.9	297	19.2	14	0.90	650	42.0	Low
501600	2,081	997	47.9	249	12.0	33	1.59	802	38.5	Low
501700	1,253	651	52.0	222	17.7	7	0.56	373	29.8	Low
501800	1,432	630	44.0	366	25.6	30	2.09	406	28.4	Low
501900	743	335	45.1	148	19.9	7	0.94	253	34.0	Low
502000	1,063	372	35.0	230	21.6	20	1.90	441	41.5	Low
502102	254	61	24.0	58	22.8	63	24.89	72	28.4	High
502300	2,149	412	19.2	488	22.7	183	8.52	1,066	49.6	Medium
502400	2,387	623	26.1	671	28.1	151	6.33	942	39.5	Medium
502500	2,401	549	22.9	827	34.4	212	8.83	813	33.9	Medium
502600	204	27	13.2	50	24.5	22	10.80	105	51.5	Medium
502902	574	45	7.8	217	37.8	109	19.00	203	35.4	Medium
502903	1,899	107	5.6	646	34.0	347	18.27	799	42.1	Medium
502904	1,072	91	8.5	446	41.6	120	11.20	415	38.7	Medium
502905	1,563	284	18.2	740	47.3	151	9.70	388	24.8	Medium
503001	1,466	260	17.7	582	39.7	214	14.60	410	28.0	Medium
503002	1,135	152	13.4	393	34.6	172	15.15	418	36.8	Medium

TABLE #21 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACTS	TOTAL	9,999 & LESS	%	10,000 TO 23,999	%	24,000 & OVER	%	UNKNOWN	%	INCOME RANGE
503003	1,536	129	8.4	810	52.7	197	12.8	400	26.0	Medium
503101	1,791	790	44.1	305	17.0	23	1.3	673	37.6	Low
503102	2,466	780	31.6	845	34.3	107	4.3	734	29.8	Medium
503103	1,694	728	43.0	364	21.5	35	2.1	567	33.5	Low
503104	1,852	567	30.6	534	28.8	92	5.0	659	35.6	Low
503201	4,113	1,065	25.9	1,605	39.0	188	4.6	1,255	30.5	Medium
503202	3,115	571	18.3	1,451	46.6	115	3.7	978	31.4	Medium
503301	2,151	299	13.9	748	34.8	43	2.0	1,061	49.3	Medium
503302	3,290	193	5.9	1,441	43.8	277	8.4	1,379	41.9	Medium
503303	3,063	428	14.0	1,375	44.9	379	12.4	881	28.8	Medium
503400	1,799	549	30.5	590	32.8	36	2.0	624	34.7	Medium
503501	2,267	634	28.0	822	36.3	41	1.8	770	34.0	Medium
503502	1,457	231	15.9	675	46.3	37	2.5	514	35.3	Medium
503503	1,630	295	18.1	734	45.0	67	4.1	534	32.8	Medium
503601	770	303	39.4	175	22.7	12	1.6	280	36.4	Low
503602	709	246	34.7	141	19.9	2	0.3	320	45.1	Low
503701	3,010	1,137	37.8	357	11.9	16	0.5	1,500	50.0	Low
503702	1,165	637	54.7	206	17.7	10	0.9	312	26.8	Low
503703	570	161	28.2	121	21.2	6	1.1	282	49.5	Low
503800	2,809	474	16.9	1,297	46.2	265	9.4	773	27.5	Medium
503900	1,709	523	30.6	575	33.6	52	3.0	559	32.7	Medium
504000	1,625	463	28.5	572	35.2	36	2.2	554	34.1	Medium
504100	1,784	525	29.4	646	36.2	61	3.4	552	30.9	Medium
504200	2,027	179	8.8	588	29.0	371	18.3	889	43.9	Medium
504301	3,583	528	14.7	1,677	46.8	282	7.9	1,096	30.6	Medium
504302	6,010	388	6.5	3,204	53.3	747	12.4	1,671	27.8	Medium
504401	1,554	203	13.1	741	47.7	109	7.0	501	32.2	Medium
504402	1,423	214	15.0	567	39.9	67	4.7	575	40.4	Medium
504403	2,947	393	13.3	1,445	49.0	252	8.6	857	29.1	Medium
504404	2,648	218	8.2	1,380	52.3	262	9.9	788	29.8	Medium
504501	1,767	378	21.4	781	44.2	101	5.7	507	28.7	Medium

TABLE #21 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACTS	TOTAL	9,999 & LESS	%	10,000 TO 23,999	%	24,000 & OVER	%	UNKNOWN	%	INCOME RANGE
504502	1,214	153	12.6	621	51.2	99	8.2	341	28.1	Medium
505000	809	158	19.5	319	39.4	64	7.9	268	33.1	Medium
505100	724	205	28.3	232	32.0	24	3.3	263	36.3	Medium
505203	720	198	27.5	150	20.8	17	2.4	355	49.3	Low
505800	1,584	411	25.9	619	39.1	85	5.4	469	29.6	Medium
511901	576	115	20.0	229	39.8	31	5.4	201	34.9	Medium
511902	5,956	154	2.6	1,749	29.4	1,785	30.0	2,268	38.1	High
512001	7,662	1,008	13.2	3,455	45.1	938	12.2	2,261	29.5	Medium
512002	2,521	373	14.8	848	33.6	96	3.8	1,204	47.8	Medium
512003	9,169	528	5.8	4,733	51.6	1,228	13.4	2,680	29.2	Medium
512004	5,160	503	9.7	2,640	51.2	522	10.1	1,495	29.0	Medium
TOTAL	145,064	30,648		52,079		11,442		50,895		

TABLE 22

HOUSEHOLD POPULATION BY
LABOR FORCE STATUS

CENSUS TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION 14+	MILITARY	EMPLOYED FULL-TIME	EMPLOYED PART-TIME	UNEMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOMEMAKER	STUDENT FULL-TIME	STUDENT PART-TIME	OTHER	NO RESPONSE	% UNEMPLOYMENT	RANK
500100	2,736	4	1,020	198	214	412	501	266	51	68	78	7.8	
500200	2,203	8	890	156	210	468	289	220	59	25	21	9.5	
500300	1,922	4	683	110	220	249	407	200	28	29	18	11.4	11
500400	1,727	1	731	160	116	260	230	213	37	18	39	6.7	
500500	3,594	6	1,330	211	151	720	838	372	47	28	170	4.2	
500600	2,563	5	900	166	117	481	402	280	37	55	246	4.6	
500700	949	1	330	79	103	198	122	68	5	16	46	10.9	15
500800	1,115	4	308	78	125	154	115	132	10	26	145	11.2	12.5
500900	2,362	4	453	277	220	196	65	1,045	128	32	205	9.3	
501000	2,816	4	739	264	369	745	258	353	87	83	84	13.1	7
501100	4,129	12	1,315	332	316	681	688	639	55	134	143	7.7	
501200	2,428	3	789	203	288	354	514	360	62	44	54	11.7	10
501300	2,259	1	712	244	151	229	159	814	126	19	7	6.7	
501400	2,715	4	581	164	262	408	547	323	29	50	29	9.7	
501500	3,046	2	1,028	156	451	399	566	348	31	52	82	14.8	3.5
501600	3,866	8	1,051	564	384	404	327	1,539	225	41	102	9.9	18.5
501700	2,434	0	819	189	370	397	420	242	24	30	66	15.2	2
501800	3,097	3	1,012	170	262	562	514	411	33	47	105	8.5	
501900	1,240	6	531	99	117	196	147	121	37	20	38	9.4	
502000	1,865	2	701	143	163	324	280	164	41	38	89	8.7	
502102	453	0	235	38	30	25	54	59	15	5	18	6.6	
502300	3,955	7	1,681	284	114	719	786	336	72	43	143	2.9	
502400	4,933	6	1,881	431	248	941	1,131	580	81	67	130	5.0	
502500	5,095	4	2,016	459	185	790	1,531	639	41	55	158	3.6	
502600	409	0	190	32	12	45	79	53	7	2	13	2.9	
502902	1,533	8	642	131	51	59	299	334	31	17	45	3.3	
502903	4,925	6	1,984	451	168	238	981	1,005	74	51	207	3.4	
502904	2,577	14	1,168	207	101	110	496	459	63	23	130	3.9	
502905	3,478	11	1,672	300	168	150	708	553	127	24	98	4.8	
503001	3,393	6	1,416	270	90	402	863	476	67	50	41	2.7	
503002	2,653	9	1,178	262	104	243	681	416	80	20	30	3.9	

TABLE 22 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION 14+	MILITARY	EMPLOYED - FULL-TIME	EMPLOYED PART-TIME	UNEMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOMEMAKER	STUDENT FULL-TIME	STUDENT PART-TIME	OTHER	NO RESPONSE	% UNEMPLOYMENT	RANK
503003	3,883	10	1,829	341	151	175	1,047	709	140	25	32	3.9	
503101	3,531	8	1,059	358	382	557	796	561	96	64	139	10.8	16
503102	5,104	15	2,054	289	601	196	1,182	765	109	63	242	11.8	9
503103	3,006	7	587	203	297	516	545	280	72	54	269	9.9	18.5
503104	3,426	9	1,478	179	190	551	807	275	51	40	87	5.5	
503201	8,934	65	3,681	640	639	848	2,207	1,210	245	113	376	7.2	
503202	7,439	54	3,035	492	816	215	1,650	1,255	266	107	601	11.0	14
503301	5,398	37	2,242	269	336	141	974	1,121	68	87	113	6.2	
503302	8,303	50	4,031	467	293	215	1,642	1,455	135	73	129	3.5	
503303	6,416	44	2,814	412	208	916	1,539	702	145	48	72	3.2	
503400	4,622	26	1,739	252	580	123	792	980	46	83	59	12.5	8
503501	6,216	21	2,191	342	839	189	1,081	1,416	94	108	98	13.5	5
503502	3,704	21	1,563	263	351	127	671	680	46	59	24	9.5	
503503	4,259	188	1,735	296	299	137	742	832	58	75	36	7.0	
503601	1,669	150	656	124	154	248	297	210	27	29	20	9.2	
503602	1,622	137	540	80	215	170	289	211	12	44	20	13.3	6
503701	5,683	145	1,936	233	639	687	950	586	60	80	447	11.2	12.5
503702	2,612	3	766	132	431	204	564	405	29	87	39	16.5	1
503703	1,361	7	462	80	202	32	262	270	14	38	26	14.8	3.5
503800	6,681	59	3,264	494	413	295	1,263	1,040	165	89	39	6.2	
503900	3,845	7	1,515	296	270	472	714	566	63	56	53	7.0	
504000	3,950	16	1,467	216	401	235	761	753	47	72	41	10.2	17
504100	4,371	14	1,617	307	330	333	866	740	35	95	49	7.5	
504200	4,956	15	2,148	454	150	463	1,097	857	87	40	23	3.0	
504301	7,420	75	3,578	388	316	669	1,699	633	170	92	31	4.3	
504302	13,985	292	7,225	996	797	410	3,230	2,123	445	112	66	5.7	
504401	3,736	42	1,691	202	246	124	737	695	72	51	30	6.6	
504402	2,897	44	1,427	161	210	87	606	385	68	38	29	7.2	
504403	7,253	130	3,238	460	579	229	1,397	1,318	185	49	266	8.0	
504404	6,218	98	3,113	407	236	159	1,385	1,081	166	60	57	3.8	
504501	3,888	72	1,688	250	251	490	1,013	528	87	57	46	6.5	

TABLE 22 - (Continued)

CENSUS TRACT	TOTAL POPULATION 14+ *	MILITARY	EMPLOYED FULL-TIME	EMPLOYED PART-TIME	UNEMPLOYED	RETIRED	HOMEMAKER	STUDENT FULL-TIME	STUDENT PART-TIME	OTHER	NO RESPONSE	% UNEMPLOYMENT
504502	2,740	48	1,379	159	212	114	603	371	79	37	44	7.7
505000	1,781	24	900	108	129	99	337	207	30	10	14	7.2
505100	1,507	4	710	130	85	137	347	190	30	14	24	5.6
505203	1,338	1	497	80	117	292	207	154	28	10	40	8.7
505800	3,257	18	1,384	339	119	486	617	397	60	31	45	3.7
511901	1,282	9	611	99	73	49	299	195	30	11	16	5.7
511902	15,510	48	6,954	1,453	432	420	4,121	3,260	412	138	172	2.8
512001	16,307	104	8,287	1,149	587	1,192	4,395	1,911	539	125	223	3.6
512002	5,395	20	2,672	339	441	201	1,127	769	93	33	156	8.2
512003	21,038	120	10,890	1,678	744	510	5,475	3,029	970	125	345	3.5
512004	11,442	42	5,837	807	343	356	3,388	1,528	439	50	183	3.0
TOTAL	320,455	2,452	136,476	23,253	20,984	25,628	68,719	49,673	7,893	3,884	7,601	

* The total population 14+ will not be equal to the sum of the other categories since people were counted more than once in several categories.



MAP XVIII:

FIRST QUARTILE RANGE OF CENSUS TRACTS DESCRIBING PERCENTAGE UNEMPLOYED BY HOUSEHOLD POPULATION

Although the format of reporting 1975 census data on income has been changed for 1970, a comparison of 1970 and 1975 data shows that areas of high, medium, and low household incomes in 1975 are essentially the same as they were in 1970.

For the most part, the census tracts having medium to high incomes also have high student attendance rates. The census tracts showing low income have low student attendance rates.

"Household Population by Labor Force Status" is shown in Table 22. This table also includes the percentage of unemployed for each census tract and ranks tracts with the greatest percentage of unemployed population. Map XVIII illustrates the census tracts having the greatest percentage of unemployment. The census tracts having the highest unemployment rate are to be found in the downtown San Jose and Alum Rock areas. As would be expected, these areas coincide with the areas having the lowest household income.

4. Summary Data

Table 23 indicates the locations of the census tracts with the highest student attendance rates for San Jose City and Evergreen Valley day and evening sessions. In addition, it summarizes associated socio-economic data for these tracts.

The census tracts with high attendance rates have a white population; medium to high income and showthe greatest increase in population between 1970-1975. These tracts are located in the eastern and southern portion of the District. (Milpitas, Berryessa, Evergreen, Edenvale and Almaden.) These data duplicates our finding in the 1975 report.

TABLE #23

HIGH STUDENT ATTENDANCE LOCATIONS AND ASSOCIATED SOCIO-ECONOMIC CENSUS DATA 1975

SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE - DAY

CENSUS TRACTS	LOCATION	INCOME RANGE	RACE	POPULATION CHANGE 1970-1975	RANK
512003	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
504302	Berryessa	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
512001	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
511902	Almaden	High	White	Increased	Q1
504403	Milpitas	Medium	White	Declined	--
512004	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
503501	Evergreen	Medium	White	Increased	--
503201	San Jose	Medium	White	Increased	--

EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE - DAY

CENSUS TRACTS	LOCATION	INCOME RANGE	RACE	POPULATION CHANGE 1970-1975	RANK
503302	Evergreen	Medium	White	Increased	--
512003	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
503303	Evergreen	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
512001	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1

SAN JOSE CITY COLLEGE - EVENING

CENSUS TRACTS	LOCATION	INCOME RANGE	RACE	POPULATION CHANGE 1970-1975	RANK
512003	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
512001	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
504302	Berryessa	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
512004	Edenvale	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
511902	Almaden	High	White	Increased	Q1

EVERGREEN VALLEY COLLEGE - EVENING

CENSUS TRACTS	LOCATION	INCOME RANGE	RACE	POPULATION CHANGE 1970-1975	RANK
503302	Evergreen	Medium	White	Increased	--
503303	Evergreen	Medium	White	Increased	Q1
512003	Evergreen	Medium	White	Increased	Q1

The census tracts showing a low student attendance rate have a high Mexican American population, low income, high unemployment rate and decrease in population. These tracts are located in the downtown San Jose and a portion of the Alum Rock areas. This area would be regarded as belonging to San Jose City College Service area.

V. Summary, Conclusions, and Uses of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to define a "college service area" for San Jose City and Evergreen Valley College, and to update the data base on District students.

In defining "college service area", two methods were used. The first method (B) looked at a census tract in terms of its relative importance to San Jose City or Evergreen Valley with regard to the total enrollment at the college. Using this approach to service area, there is no overlap and a tract belongs to one college or the other.

Employing this method, we find that students attending Evergreen Valley College reside in the eastern portion of the District or what is essentially the East Side Union High School District. Students attending San Jose City College reside closer to that college in what is essentially the San Jose Unified and part of Milpitas Union High School District.

The second method of defining service area (Method C) does not compare one college with the other, but asked the question, "Which census tracts are most important in contributing students to the enrollment of either San Jose City or Evergreen Valley College." The census tracts

contributing large numbers of students to both colleges are to be found in the eastern and southern portion of the District (Milpitas, Berryessa, Evergreen, Edenvale, and New Almaden.) These census tracts essentially have a majority white population, medium to high income, and have shown the greatest growth in population. Areas of low student attendance are to be found in the downtown San Jose, Alum Rock area. These census tracts show a Mexican American population, low income, high unemployment rate and a declining population. This area would be considered to be within San Jose City's service area; whereas the faster growing higher income area would be within Evergreen Valley College's service area. One wonders, therefore, as Evergreen Valley College continues to grow, will the population at San Jose City College and Evergreen Valley College polarize with white students attending Evergreen Valley College and poorer minority students attending San Jose City College.

Other information of interest, is that the District's population is growing more rapidly than the County and has a higher minority population than the County. Here again, we see the importance of looking at the District's community as a distinct entity rather than generalizing from Santa Clara County information.

Selected Uses of the Study

This report should be used like a dictionary. It is intended as a tool by which administrators can gain a better understanding of the community and students they serve.

We suggest that the information provided be used in the following ways:

Planning

1) Administrators at both colleges should become familiar with the procedure and college's service areas detailed in the study and the associated socio-economic data for day and evening students. This will provide them with information concerning how the area was defined and the characteristics of their students and the community they serve.

2. In projecting future growth at the colleges, it would be useful to note which areas would be most likely to contribute students. This can be done by checking the maps on population changes, and those on the "First Quartile Range of Students."

3) The growth of student enrollment as compared to the growth of the District's population might be considered, to see if the District is keeping pace.

4) Special note might be made of areas which are far from the colleges and would benefit from satellite centers.

5) "College Service Areas" and student attendance rates might be compared with public transportation maps to see if there is any correlation. Is bus transportation (convenient transportation) a factor that affects the college service area?

Recruitment

The outreach coordinator should be aware of census tracts which have low attendance rates. Special recruitment efforts can be made in tracts which are underserved or have a high minority population. Consideration might be given to whether the District plans to keep each of the college's enrollment racially balanced and thus to recruit

with this purpose. Further, new programs might be developed to attract more students from underserved areas.

Curriculum Development

Curriculum planners should note the differences in "college service areas" for San Jose City and Evergreen Valley College and see if their curricula meet the needs of two areas which differ in socio-economic background. They might consider how well the curriculum relates to the high school area being served. When new programs are developed, need assessments can be conducted in census tracts showing a high unemployment rate.

Grant Preparation

Descriptive information concerning the demographic nature of the District is required for federal, state and local grant requests. This report can be used as a handy reference for such information.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

1. Develop plans and strategies based on this study, to implement the philosophy of recent civil rights legislation with regard to minorities and women to insure equal educational opportunities for all.
2. Review, reevaluate, and assess the degree to which existing curricula appear to relate to the changing requirements of the District and specifically individual college service areas, caused by population change, housing development, ethnic, economic, and social factors. Continue to add facilities at Evergreen Valley College as well as update them at San Jose City College.

3. This study shows that the Evergreen Valley College service area in particular will experience expanded population growth. Consequently, there is clear support for the decision to continue to expand their facilities to enable them to handle the growing educational requirements of the tax payers they serve.

4. Conduct a similar study whenever new census data becomes available, probably at least every five years. The social, economic, political, and physical situation of the District and individual college service areas continues to reflect signs of growth, stabalization, and decline; in short, the situation is ever changing and dynamic. Hence, it is critical that the programs and curricula of the District and individual college service areas reflect these changes.

5. Remodel, rennovate, and improve the physical facilities of San Jose City College. Of the two college service areas, the one most apt to stabalize or decline is that of San Jose City College. San Jose City College tends to serve more of the extremes with regard to income, minority population and change. It is critical that its facilities be improved to enable them to continue to attract students from their service area.

6. Expand on earlier efforts to predict future change and develop plans to anticipate future events rather than to take a "wait and see" approach to problem solving. This study and others now available should be used as data bases for decisions that will have to be made if problems/issues of the future are to be obviated.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 12 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES